SENATE—*Wednesday, September 10, 1969*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON, a Senator from the State of Kansas.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, whose mercies are new every morning, open our eyes to Thy beauty, open our minds to Thy truth, open our hearts to Thy spirit, and use us this day to advance the Nation's welfare and extend Thy kingdom among men.

Draw together the world of the visible and the invisible, the temporal and the eternal, and unite us in our labors with that unseen Host, whom we have loved long since and lost awhile. Grant that being compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses we may run with patience the race that is set before us looking unto the author and finisher of our faith for guidance and strength.

In His holy name, we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PEARSON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 9, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with Department of Justice.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 388 and 389.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ADULT-YOUTH COMMUNICATIONS WEEK

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 614) authorizing the President to proclaim the week of September 28, 1969, through October 4, 1969, as "National Adult-Youth Communications Week," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-394), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the joint resolution is to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week of September 28, 1969, through October 4, 1969, as "National Adult-Youth Communications Week."

STATEMENT

This legislation will demonstrate to young people in all parts of the United States that meaningful change can be brought about through the democratic legislative process rather than through violence or by taking over administration buildings. It is hoped that this resolution would encourage the communication of ideas and cooperation between persons of different generations.

The committee is of the opinion that this resolution has a meritorious purpose and accordingly recommends favorable consideration thereof without amendment.

RESTORATION OF THE GOLDEN EAGLE PROGRAM TO THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2315) to restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, after line 2, insert:

(c) The first sentence of section 8 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Not to exceed $30,000,000 of the money authorized to be appropriated from the fund by section 3 of this Act may be obligated by contract during each fiscal year for the acquisition of lands, waters, or interest therein within areas specified in section 6(a)(1) of this Act."

After line 10, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2(a)(1) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), is amended by deleting "$7" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10".

(b) Section 7 of such Act (78 Stat. 903), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except to the extent that the Secretary of the Interior determines necessary in order to advertise and promote any entrance or user fee program established pursuant to section 2(a) of this Act."

After line 19, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 746) is repealed.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 2315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes", approved July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 354; Public Law 90-401), is hereby repealed.

(b) Subsection (c) of section 2 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-5), as added by section 2 of the Act of July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 354; Public Law 90-401), is redesignated as subsection (d).

(c) The first sentence of section 8 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Not to exceed $30,000,000 of the money authorized to be appropriated from the fund by section 3 of this Act may be obligated by contract during each fiscal year for the

acquisition of lands, waters, or interest therein within areas specified in section 6(a)(1) of this Act."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2(a)(1) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), is amended by deleting "$7" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10".

(b) Section 7 of such Act (78 Stat. 903), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except to the extent that the Secretary of the Interior determines necessary in order to advertise and promote any entrance or user fee program established pursuant to section 2(a) of this Act."

SEC. 3. Section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 746) is repealed.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, we on the Interior Committee reported out a bill S. 2315, which would extend the golden eagle passport. To many Oregonians, the golden eagle is the best investment they can make in their vacation enjoyment. Each time they visit an area, the cost drops.

I wish to highlight two groups of people who profit greatly from the golden eagle program. They are senior citizens and large families. Many older Oregonians have written me to tell of their great pleasure in using our parks. The golden eagle offers them an opportunity to visit our parks as often as they can with no increase in cost. Because so many elderly people have fixed incomes, the golden eagle helps hold down the cost of vacation plans.

Large families are not penalized by a per-person charge, and, therefore, are encouraged to take family vacations. I think the Senate shares my belief that we should encourage such endeavors, and the golden eagle is a step in that direction.

I support the golden eagle and am pleased to be a cosponsor of the bill.

The reason I speak today is to point out the support in my State for the program. I wish to call attention to a fine article from the East Oregonian of Friday, August 29, 1969, written by Mrs. Bernice Riley. I think that it represents the views not only of Oregonians, but of many Americans.

Mr. President, Mrs. Riley captures the feelings of many of us who support the bill. Because of the interest in this bill, I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Mrs. Riley printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLDEN EAGLE PERMITS TO BE TERMINATED

(By Mrs. Bernice Riley)

The first of September marks the end of summer to many families in this area. There will still be several weeks of bright, sunny days. But the nights will turn crisp and there will be the feeling of autumn in the air.

Camping equipment will soon be stored to await the return of the long vacation period, when we head for the mountains almost every weekend.

This part of Oregon is blessed with vast forests unmarked by the inroads of commercial exploitation. Outdoor lovers can find camp spots at a hundred places, tree-shaded, with creeks winding through meadows or rippling over rocks in the gorges.

The Umatilla National Forest maintains camp facilities in many scenic locations. Eight of these, with tables, water and sanitary facilities, are "charge camps."

This means there is a box at the entry to the camp, where you leave a dollar for each night you'll be staying there.

(If you go to Union Creek Camp, at Mason Dam in the Wallowa-Whitman Forest, you'll pay $2 a night. But you can connect your trailer to water, sewer and electricity. This is the only forest camp in the west with such plush facilities.)

For the past several years the Forest Service has offered vacationers a bargain fee for use of camps, and for entry into national parks. You've been able to buy a "Golden Eagle" card for $7, good anywhere in the United States for a year.

"The law was passed by Congress," said Jay Hughes, recreation director on the Umatilla Forest, "as part of the land and water conservation fund act of 1965. This act provided $150 million yearly to expand the recreation program in the nation."

Hughes said many people have believed the $7 fee for the Golden Eagle goes directly back into the Forest Service for development of more recreation areas.

"This isn't true," he said. "Actually, 60 per cent of all land and water conservation funds goes to the states, and only 16 per cent of the remainder is allocated to federal agencies west of the Mississippi River."

Hughes said the states pass along their share of the fund to counties for development of local facilities, after a community plan has been made and approved, and matching funds have been assured.

"For example, the tennis courts at Athena were built partly with these funds. And Pendleton has bought some property adjacent to McKay Creek School under this program." The remainder of county funds will go into development of the camp ground at the Port of Umatilla.

The Forest Service use of the fund can be only for land acquisition, said Hughes. He said the only project currently underway in the Umatilla Forest is Kelly Prairie, where a lake will be built. Land is being purchased for this new recreation site.

So, if you have felt that you are contributing to the maintenance of your national forest when you pay $7 for a Golden Eagle, you'll have to adjust your feeling of ownership a bit.

You are buying land for new camp sites. You are paying for recreational facilities in your home town as well.

Apparently you aren't paying enough.

For this is the last year the Golden Eagle will be available, said Hughes. "The program will be discontinued at the end of this year. Congress has decided to return to the policy of an individual fee for use of each facility."

He said there has been complaint because some of the big national parks, such as Yellowstone, Yosemite and Grand Canyon have suffered a big decline in receipts since the Golden Eagle went into effect.

"Some of those parks charge as much as $2.50 admission. Golden Eagle owners have been gaining entry by showing their cards."

The director observed that termination of the Golden Eagle will work a hardship on persons on fixed incomes who may spend seven or eight months a year traveling with trailers or campers. These people use the federal campgrounds with no other charge than their yearly $7 fee.

Low-income families may spend almost every weekend during the summer in a forest campground, said Hughes. These people too will be hurt by termination of the Golden Eagle.

There has been some discontent voiced by the public over termination of this bargain fee. Letters are being sent to members of the Congress and U.S. Senate, asking that the policy be continued. If there are enough letters, the solons may reconsider.

Hughes said the Umatilla Forest collected $1,206 in dollar fees from the charge camps in 1968. That same year 507 Golden Eagle cards were purchased for $3,549.

It may be that few people will object to paying the dollar a night to use a forest camp ground.

On the other hand, when the camper displays his Golden Eagle, he has tangible evidence that he is part owner of the great national forests in our country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-395), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF S. 2315

The primary objective of this measure, as introduced by Senator Jackson and amended by the committee, is to retain the extremely popular golden eagle program created by the original enactment of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended. The legislation would restore the golden eagle passport program due to expire next March, while also increasing the annual fee from $7 to $10. The bill also continues the advance contract authority of the Secretary of the Interior to deal with the increasingly serious problem of land-cost escalation. He had this authority for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 for the acquisition of certain land, water, or interests therein.

Other provisions of S. 2315, as amended, include: (1) authorization for the Secretary of the Interior to advertise and promote entrance or user fee programs currently in operation and, (2) repeal of section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968, which, as interpreted, precludes the sale of golden eagle passports in recreation areas under the administrative jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

BACKGROUND OF THE GOLDEN EAGLE PROGRAM

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of September 3, 1964, Public Law 88-578, established the Land and Water Conservation Fund, as of January 1, 1965, to help expand local, State, and Federal outdoor recreation opportunities.

The act authorized as revenue for the fund: (1) Proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property, (2) Federal motorboat fuels tax, and (3) Entrance, admission, and user fees at Federal recreation areas, or the so-called golden eagle program.

Money appropriated by Congress from the fund is used by the National Park Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to acquire authorized national outdoor recreation lands and waters; and as matching grants to the States and their political subdivisions for planning, acquiring, and developing outdoor recreation areas and facilities. During the first 5 fiscal years of the fund, receipts have averaged around $100 million annually.

In 1968, Congress amended the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide that the original sources of revenue to the fund could be augmented to provide a fund of $200 million annually, during fiscal years 1969 and 1973. The additional income to the fund, if not appropriated into the fund by Congress, will be earmarked from Outer Continental Shelf mineral leasing receipts.

By the same 1968 act, Congress repealed authority for the annual Federal recreation area permit, known as the golden eagle passport, and for other recreation entrance and used fees collected under the golden eagle program. Under the 1968 act, the Federal

agencies are not precluded from collecting recreation fees at their areas, but after March 31, 1970, no such collections may be made under the auspices of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

ADMISSION AND USER FEES

Support for the enactment of S. 2315 and a continuation of the popular golden eagle program came through thousands of letters received from citizens throughout the Nation urging reconsideration of the action terminating the golden eagle and other fee programs next March. Many, if not a majority of these citizens were retired people living on fixed incomes who have found a new way of spending their retirement years in the out of doors at a price they can afford. Others supported user and admission fees because they do not adversely affect large families by extending a "per person" charge. Consequently, family vacations are encouraged, and the costs are reduced.

The golden eagle passport, purchased for $7, provides access to all Federal recreation areas including national parks, seashores, recreation areas, monuments, and historic sites under the jurisdiction of the Department of Interior, and recreational areas operated by both the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture.

During the hearing on S. 2315, it was reported by a witness representing the U.S. Forest Service that the fee system—

* * * has led to significant improvement in administration of use of National Forest recreation developments, facilities and services provided at public expense.

Particularly, we believe recreation users have had greater interest in and respect for the areas they visit. In turn, the emphasis of the program has encouraged us to continue to provide high quality recreation opportunities.[1]

A Department of the Interior witness, also testifying in favor of S. 2315, confirmed a statement that the National Park Service encountered reduced vandalism and destruction to areas under its administration where an entrance charge is collected. The Interior Department witness states "* * * I think it is not an uncommon phenomenon that when you have to pay for something you are a little more careful of that something than if you get it for nothing."[2]

Continuation of the golden eagle program is completely consistent with the national policy of requesting users of special public facilities to be responsible for paying their fair share of the costs. For many years, the Federal Government has had a policy that where the use of Federal resources convey special benefits to identifiable recipients above and beyond those which accrue to the general public, such recipients should pay a reasonable charge for the service or product received or for the resource used. The Department of the Interior reports, for example, that specific charges are made for other similar recreational services such as bathhouses, boat launching ramps, cabins, overnight shelters, electricity, fuel and winter sports facilities.

A similar policy of collecting fees for special benefits also exists at the State level of government. Forty-seven of the 50 States make charges for the use of tent and trailer campsites or for picnicking, swimming, water access, shelter rentals, boat rides, et cetera. The charges for the use of overnight camping facilities range from 50 cents per night for tent campsites to $3.50 per night for trailer campsites.

LAND ACQUISITION CONTRACTS

In the act of July 15, 1968, language was added which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to enter into advance contracts prior to actual appropriation for the acquisition of certain lands and waters within authorized Federal recreational areas for fiscal years 1969 and 1970. The advance contract limitation was $30 million annually. If enacted, S. 2315 would continue this advance contract authority.

In reviewing the operation and conduct of the program by the responsible agencies, the committee found that advance contract authorization served as an important anti-inflationary measure and useful land management and acquisition tool. With recreational land price increases averaging 5 to 10 percent per year for land not in close proximity to water, and significantly higher for water-oriented areas, the advance contract authority has the potential of enabling the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture to purchase lands and waters at substantial savings.

Although this provision does not alleviate the frustrating, and as yet unresolved problem of rapid land price escalation of new parks and recreation areas between the time a bill is introduced to create such an area, and the time it finally becomes law, it does at least shorten the time between enactment and the availability of appropriations. In extending the advance contract authorization provision, the committee expressed its belief that this authority should be utilized in recently authorized areas, areas where the best opportunities and greatest need occur, and sites where prices are rising or are likely to rise rapidly enough to jeopardize eventual Federal purchase.

INCREASING GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT COST TO $10

Section 2(a) of the amended bill, S. 2315, amends the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, by increasing the golden eagle passport cost from $7 to $10. The committee members, in agreeing to this provision, stated that many of those who favor extension of the golden eagle program actually expressed a willingness to have a fee increase. Some users of the passport spend weeks, and even months in Federal outdoor recreational areas, and consequently do not contribute a reasonable share of the costs associated with maintaining those areas.

EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR ADVERTISING ADMISSION AND USER FEE PROGRAMS

The committee, in reporting this measure, expressed the belief that the revenues collected under the golden eagle and other recreational fee programs during the last 4 calendar years are not a true reflection of the future funds which can be generated under this program. The passport's apparent lack of acceptance until recently by recreationists was felt to be caused by incomplete knowledge of the program stemming from restrictions imposed on the advertising of the golden eagle passport. The committee feels that as the benefits to be derived from these fee programs are better understood, brought about through the expenditure of funds for advertising, that participation will expand, thus substantially adding to the revenue source of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

A study conducted by the Arthur D. Little, Inc., for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation provided recommendations on both the collection and advertising systems of the entire Federal recreation area permit and fee system. The report, entitled "Marketing Study and Recommendations Concerning Federal Recreation Area Permit and Fee System," recommended that a major, adequately funded, program be implemented for the educational task of attaining greater public acceptance and conformity of Land and Water Conservation fee programs. For the 1969 recreation season, the study recommended the expenditure of $1 million be made available for a mass-media advertising approach to the permit and fee program. Approximately one-half to one-third of this amount was recommended for each succeeding fiscal year.

In referring to the potential revenues capable of being generated from increased public information on fee programs, the report stated:

In the absence of adequate indication of congressional intent as to the amount of revenue to be raised from a recreation area user fee program, except indications that the present level of revenues is considered to be inadequate and disappointing, we recommend a permit system which for 1969 as a first calendar year of operation, would be designed to raise approximately $33 million of gross revenue of which $29 to $30 million would be carried into the land and water conservation fund net of the cost of sales commissions. It is also designed to have increasing revenues in each succeeding year so that 1979 net revenues into the fund would be $58 million, and total revenues for the years 1969–89 would be about $1,250 million.

USER FEE COLLECTIONS BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act listed the Corps of Engineers as one of several agencies deemed appropriate to collect user and admission fees for support of the fund on recreational lands under its jurisdiction. In practice, however, the corps which has over 4,000 recreation areas and has in excess of one-quarter billion visitations each year, has made only minimal contributions to the fund through the collection of admission and user fees. Nearly 75 percent of the total collection of admission and user fees come from the Department of the Interior, while another 20 percent is collected by the Department of Agriculture. The remaining 5 percent are received by all other agencies combined, including the Corps of Engineers.

While the Corps of Engineers maintained at our hearing that it has no objection to an indefinite extension of the admission and user fee programs, it feels that it is prohibited from collecting any such fees as a result of provisions in section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90–483). Subsequent to passage of this act last year, the Corps of Engineers discontinued, entirely, fee collections of any kind at recreation areas under their administration. Section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 is printed below:

SEC. 210. No entrance or admission fees shall be collected after March 31, 1970, by any officer or employee of the United States at public recreation areas located at lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. User fees at these lakes and reservoirs shall be collected by officers and employees of the United States only from users of highly developed facilities requiring continuing presence of personnel for maintenance and supervision of the facilities, and shall not be collected for access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided.

Prior to enactment of this act, the corps collected admission and user fees at as many as 189 areas according to the criteria established by the President in Executive Order 11200.

[1] Refer to page 42 of the hearing record on the "golden eagle program", held before the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, July 17 and 18, 1969.

[2] Refer to page 34 of the hearing of July 17 and 18 cited above.

In a recent letter to Senator Jackson from Major General Clarke, Deputy Chief of Engineers, it was reported that the corps, acting in accordance with the procedures established, issued regulations governing the collection of fees. The criteria, as set forth in the corps letter, states as follows:

The Corps of Engineers, in accordance with the procedures established, issued regulations governing the collection of fees at its projects. Under these regulations no entrance fees were charged at projects, where the total Federal investment in recreational facilities for the entire project was less than $50,000, and the recreation pool was less than 100 acres. Entrance fees were collected at designated public use areas of the project where at least $25,000 had been spent by the Federal Government on recreational facilities at each area, apart from roads; there were at least 25 acres of usable land available in the area above the conservation pool; there was an annual recreational attendance of at least 50,000 per year; and the area had potential for further recreational development. Consideration was also given to such factors as to whether there were other access areas on the same project with minimum recreation facilities where no fee was charged. There was at least one such no-charge area at each project. The developed areas for which entrance fees were charged contained such facilities as campsites, water, toilets, picnic tables, boat launching ramps, and the like.

The committee believes that the Corps of Engineers should not be exempt from charging entrance or user fees at its recreational areas, when other Federal agencies such as the Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management presently impose such fees. The corps, which supports more waterborne recreational users than any other Federal agency, could make a significant contribution to the land and water conservation fund if included among the other fee-collecting agencies.

The Corps of Engineers places heavy reliance upon the use of recreational benefits to justify the construction of navigation and multiple-use dams and reservoirs. For example, Public Law 90-483, the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act, approved August 13, 1968, authorized the construction of 19 projects which included multiple-purpose reservoirs in the plan for development. Total benefits accruing to all project purposes would be $71,322,400 annually of which $22,781,090, representing 32 percent, would accrue to recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement.

As the corps becomes more recreationally oriented, their investments will constitute an increasingly larger portion of the Federal Government's investment in public recreation. Therefore, it seems appropriate that revenues should be derived from these investments to help support such activities.

COST

The continuation of the golden eagle will not enlarge the land and water conservation fund program because the ceiling is set at $200 million a year. Rather, if the golden eagle, and other fee collections are continued the income from such sales will go into the fund and the amount of mineral receipts entering the fund will be reduced accordingly. Therefore, the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury will benefit to the extent of the golden eagle and other related fee income.

At the request of Senator Bible, chairman of the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, the committee was provided with data from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation as to the cost of collecting recreation fees. Subsequent to the hearing on S. 2315, the committee received correspondence from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, stating:

We have carefully reviewed all available information relating to the costs of collecting recreation fees. None of the agencies involved has a cost accounting system that would reflect actual costs of collecting such fees. The estimate of 10 percent used by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation includes the same cost items as the other agencies use. One reason for the difference is that each agency figures its costs in relation to the funds it collects. Many permits are sold by mail orders addressed to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. While the cost of checking Passports at areas, answering questions and processing visitors falls on the managing agencies, the revenues from the mail order sales cannot be credited to specific agencies. Thus, their costs may run 15 to 20 percent. Overall, we believe that total costs will not exceed 12 to 15 percent of total collections.

During the executive session on S. 2315, the committee thoroughly discussed the anticipated costs of advertising the annual passport to increase public awareness and acceptance of the program. Rather than establish rigid guidelines on expenditures, the committee felt that the Secretary of the Interior should be given sufficient latitude to expend such sums as he deems necessary in order to advertise and promote any recreational entrance or user fees of the golden eagle passport. The committee anticipates that the Appropriations Committee will review these expenditure requests each year.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recommends that S. 2315, as amended, be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OFFICERS' BONANZA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in 1966 Congress was prevailed on to pass the 10-percent overseas savings plan. Generals galore appeared before the House and Senate Armed Services Committees claiming GI's in Vietnam and other foreign countries—a total 1,422,000 at this time—should be encouraged to save money. I voted against the bill predicting at the time that it would become a bonanza for officers, but mean little to enlisted men and draftees. The fact is that 50 percent of eligible officers have made deposits, but only 15 percent of GI's. Many high-ranking officers are depositing much more than their "unallotted pay and allowances" notwithstanding that monthly deposits were limited to pay and allowances. Instead of the $25 million expected to be deposited, approximately $200 million was deposited in the first 14 months, mostly by officers. Unfortunately, American taxpayers are paying that 10-percent interest compounded quarterly. The money paid in interest to officers greatly exceeds actual deposits made by enlisted men and draftees overseas.

Unfortunately, this program has a rule that GI's cannot withdraw any of their deposits while overseas unless they prove an emergency. GI's in Vietnam, for example, desiring a rest and relaxation trip to Australia or Hong Kong naturally need their money, so very few make deposits. Officers who borrow money in the United States and whose relatives send their own money or borrow money in the United States at from 5 percent to 8 percent and then send bank drafts and checks overseas have no desire to end this bonanza. Obviously, relatives and close friends send bank drafts for deposit at 10-percent interest compounded quarterly by their officer relative, or friend, and join in this profiteering. The Secretary of Defense should end this racket. He should lower the interest rate to 5 or 6 percent without delay. This would not affect GI's adversely. It would end the racketeering and quick profiteering being made by some thousands of officers.

S. 2876—INTRODUCTION OF THE CAMPAIGN BROADCAST REFORM ACT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today it is my privilege to introduce the Campaign Broadcast Reform Act of 1969, together with the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and Senators ANDERSON, BROOKE, BURDICK, CASE, CRANSTON, DODD, EAGLETON, FULBRIGHT, GOODELL, GRAVEL, HARRIS, HARTKE, HATFIELD, HOLLINGS, HUGHES, INOUYE, KENNEDY, MCGOVERN, MATHIAS, METCALF, MUSKIE, MONTOYA, NELSON, PELL, PERCY, RANDOLPH, SAXBE, SCOTT, SCHWEIKER, SMITH, SPONG, TYDINGS, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio.

Earlier this year I resubmitted the Campaign Finance Act (S. 1692) which was originally introduced several years ago. That bill is designed to broaden the contributions base in public affairs by offering tax incentives to small- and medium-sized donors to political campaigns. The bill would also require much more stringent reporting of all campaign spending. At that time I noted that the rising costs of political campaigns was rapidly pricing many qualified men of modest means out of the public arena. A better system of reporting and a broadened contributions base would help alleviate the problem, of course, but they could not alone halt the costly trend that is rapidly making a mockery of our democratic election philosophy. Thus, something must also be done to directly reduce the major costs of seeking public office. That is the purpose of the legislation we introduce today, for it is obvious that the greatest expense faced by serious candidates for Federal office is incurred in the purchase of television time.

Mr. President, the Campaign Broadcast Reform Act is designed to provide candidates for the House and Senate with the opportunity to purchase, at significantly reduced rates, the minimum amount of time demanded by today's modern campaigns. The bill applies only to nominated candidates for the House and Senate, and is limited to the 5 weeks preceding the November general elections. Recognizing the average candidate's preference for spot announcements, it provides a basic amount of spot time to be used in segments of 1 minute or less. Also offered is a bonus amount of program time at an even greater cost reduction to encourage the use of longer, more educational segments of not less than 5 minutes' duration each. Every affected candidate is free to use some, none, or all of the discount time, in whatever manner he chooses—prime or nonprime time, long or short segments, film or live. Moreover, he is in no way prohibited from purchasing additional television time at regular rates if he so desires.

SPOT TIME PROVISIONS

Mr. President, under this bill each candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives would be entitled to purchase 60 1-minute segments of prime television time, or the equivalent, and each candidate for the U.S. Senate would be allotted 120 1-minute segments of prime television time, or the equivalent, to be used in the 5 weeks prior to the general election. Recognizing the schedule variations in the 50 States, prime time is defined as the continuous 3-hour period of the broadcast day which reflects a station's highest published rates.

On every television station, the cost for 1 minute at 9 p.m. is more than for 1 minute at 9 a.m. Also, the cost of a 20-second spot is more than one-third of the cost for the full 60-second spot.

Spot time equivalencies, when a candidate requests some or all of his spot time allotment in nonprime time and/or in segments of less than 1 minute, would be derived from the station's highest published rate for the 1-minute, prime time spot; for example, the single spot, one-time buyer rate. These rates are available in, or can be derived from the rate schedules published in such accepted buyers' guides as Standard Rate and Data.

For purposes of a simple example, assume a rate schedule such as the following:

$100 per one 60-sec. spot at prime time.
$50 per one 20-sec. spot at prime time.
$50 per one 60-sec. spot at non-prime time.
$25 per one 20-sec. spot at non-prime time.

In this case, the equivalent of a prime time 1-minute spot would be two 20-second prime time spots, two 1-minute nonprime spots, or four 20-second nonprime spots. In this way the candidates in any given race would benefit as equally as possible in terms of the monetary discount they received, while the total air time used by each would vary according to the actual composition of the schedule which each candidate devised.

COST DISCOUNTS

For both House and Senate candidates, the charge by broadcasters for spot time would be 30 percent of the regular commercial rate charged by the licensee for comparable use of the station. Thus, the discount would apply to the general rate schedule, including the discount prices which stations generally afford commercial buyers in the purchase of long-term or multiple-unit packages. In regard to the discount provisions, as well as the equivalency provision mentioned above, the FCC would have the power to review station's current rate schedules. The Commission would be expected to issue such general regulations and instructions as necessary to assure uniform application of these provisions, and in the case of disputes to investigate and rule promptly.

Mr. President, in each constituency, all UHF and VHF licensees would be expected to share equally the responsibility for providing the necessary broadcast time. Thus, while these individual requirements will vary from district to district and State to State, no broadcaster would bear a larger burden than any other licensee in his given area. In no case would any station be expected to assume the responsibility of another; should a candidate not wish to purchase his allotted time on one or more of the stations in his constituency, this portion of time would be sacrificed from his total allotment.

House races: For every House candidate—except those running at large—the sixty 1-minute segments to which he is entitled would be equally divided among the broadcast stations located within the geographical boundaries of the congressional district and such stations outside the district whose broadcast area population—for instance, the population residing within the radius of the station's "A-contour" broadcast area—includes at least one-third of the population of the given district. Example: If there are three stations in the district and one just outside which counts one-third of the district's population in its A-contour market area, the candidate's 60-minute allotment would be equally divided among these four stations: each offering him 15 minutes of discounted time.

Senate races: The 120 1-minute segments to which each Senate candidate is entitled, and the sixty 1-minute segments in the case of House candidates running at large, would be equally divided among those broadcasters located within the State and such broadcasters outside the State, one-fifth of whose broadcast area population—or a contour population—reside within the State.

It should be possible to estimate well in advance the total amount of time required to be provided by any given station in any given election year, thus permitting licensees to set aside adequate time for political candidates. It is also presumed that a licensee would have the right, whether formally or informally established, to preempt commercial advertisers during the 5-week preelection period if necessary to meet the requirements established by this law. Obviously, we hope that any such instances would be the exception and not the rule.

PROGRAM TIME PROVISIONS

Mr. President, in order to encourage broader exposure of candidates and issues, broadcasters would also be required to offer candidates the opportunity to purchase an additional bonus of program time—that is, time to be used in segments of 5 minutes or more. Each candidate for the House and Senate would be entitled to a 30-minute program, or its equivalent, on each of the stations required to provide him time. Station responsibility is defined exactly as it is in the section dealing with spot time allotments.

Program time equivalencies are derived from the highest published rate charged for the basic time unit, as in the spot-time formula, but in this case the base unit is the 30-minute prime-time program, rather than the 60-second prime-time spot announcement.

For both House and Senate candidates, the cost of this program time would be 20 percent of the regular commercial rate charged by the station for comparable use for other purposes. As in the case of spot-time discounts, the FCC would have the power to review a station's rates and to issue such regulations as necessary.

PROCEDURES FOR REQUESTING, ALLOTTING, AND PURCHASING POLITICAL TIME

Candidates and broadcasters, or their representatives, would neogtiate the purchase of spot and program time much as they now do, within the limits of the timetable specified in the bill. This would require submission of applications and schedule requests by candidates at least 60 days before the election and the presentation of a suggested schedule by the broadcaster to each candidate 40 days before the election. A minimum of 5 days would be left for resolving problems or disagreements. Special provision is made to cover late primaries where a candidate is not selected until after the 60-day schedule submission date. Almost all candidates are now required to make payment for time purchased prior to broadcast, and under the Campaign Broadcast Reform Act, candidates would be expected to continue to observe this procedure. In order to assure uniformity and fairness, the FCC would have responsibility for prescribing the form of the applications and schedule presentations and for arbitrating disputes.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACH

Mr. President, other avenues of reform are open and certainly should be explored. In recognition of this fact, the Campaign Broadcast Reform Act of 1969 is not offered as a panacea for the problem of skyrocketing campaign expenditures. Rather, it is submitted simply as a focus for discussion and a stimulus for debate. Thus, the sponsors of this bill are not wedded to every comma and semicolon contained within it. Quite the contrary. We are open to any reasonable approach which addresses the problem. But we do ask that the problem be ad-

dressed and, that after careful deliberation, action be taken.

In considering any alternative approaches, however, let us remember that the use of a small amount of discounted time such as we propose circumvents many of the complications that are raised by legislation which would substantially alter the equal-time provision of section 315 of the Federal Communications Act. Any such alterations always run the grave risk of exposing the broadcast industry to the very abuses that section 315 was designed to prevent when it was originally enacted 35 years ago.

The Campaign Broadcast Reform Act manages to avoid all these pitfalls while still providing a guarantee of access to the television medium for every serious candidate. Yet, because the cost of even discounted broadcast time is relatively high, strong deterrents guard against abuse by frivolous candidates and protect the broadcast industry in high-priced metropolitan areas where television is not now a campaign factor.

THE NEED FOR REFORM

Mr. President, the cost of television campaigning in the United States—the only country in the world that charges its candidates for access to the medium—is making it impossible for a man of moderate means to run for public office unless he successfully curries the support of wealthy men or powerful special-interest groups.

The total cost of all campaigns in the United States last year is estimated at approximately $300 million, an increase of 50 percent since 1964 and 100 percent since 1956. Roughly $58.9 million of this total was expended on political broadcasts, 64.5 percent being spent on television. If we limited our attention solely to the Federal offices that would be affected by the Campaign Broadcast Reform Act, the proportion spent on television would be much, much higher.

Even when production costs are eliminated, the amounts spent on political television time are enormous. In 1952 the declared figure for all candidates was $3 million, excluding primaries. In 1956 the comparable figure was $6.6 million; in 1960, $10 million; in 1964, $17.5 million; and in 1968, $27.4 million. These rising broadcast expenses represent greater use of television as well as higher costs, of course. But we cannot ignore the fact that television rates also climbed by an average of 30 to 40 percent between 1961 and 1967.

Mr. President, from the time Abraham Lincoln spent 75 cents on his 1864 Congressional campaign until the early 1950's, most of the growth in political spending corresponded to the increases in our population and our cost of living. That campaign spending has jumped 114 percent since 1952 can only be directly attributable to the television revolution in American politics. The cost per vote cast for the two major party candidates never exceeded 19 to 20 cents during the years 1912 through 1928. In fact, it even remained at this low level through the elections of 1952 and 1956. But in the past 12 years this cost indicator has soared upward by over 300 percent, reaching 67 cents per vote in 1968 when spending on behalf of third party candidate George Wallace is included.

The full extent of the insatiable demands imposed by this campaign revolution are best revealed when the specific requirements for House and Senate races are considered. For example, many, many House races cost each candidate at least $100,000—of which 40 to 50 percent is often spent on broadcast time. As for the Senate, several candidates last year were told by their advertising agencies that television would cost them 10 cents for every man, woman, and child in their States. This meant that senatorial candidates in six States could expect to pay at least a million dollars for television if they conducted a well run campaign. In California and New York the sum would be nearer $2 million. And these figures do even include the cost of producing the advertisements. These extras are normally equivalent to one-fourth the expense of purchasing the time needed to air them.

Mr. President, the television industry has done a marvelous job in bringing the issues developed in our major campaigns before the public. The nightly newscasts and special documentaries represent worthy efforts to provide the vital information every intelligent voter needs to make a wise choice. But the hard fact remains that these efforts, by necessity, are highly condensed and, as a result, are of limited effectiveness. For example, a half-hour news show, literally covering the entire world's events, is equivalent in content to only three-quarters of a single newspaper page.

Our radio stations, too, must be considered in evaluating the need for reform of our political broadcast practices. For, certainly, they, too, have contributed, however unwittingly, to today's dangerous cost spiral. The problems involved in defining the minimum discount-time obligations of radio broadcasters is much more difficult, however, given the far greater number of stations involved. And, as pointed out earlier, radio advertising costs are a relatively small percentage of television costs at the Federal level where we must operate. No doubt reform is needed here, too, but we cannot delay action on the heart of the problem—television—while waiting for a solution of the minor issues.

With each year that passes, the crisis grows more grave, and if any action is to be taken by 1970 we will have to begin now, where we can, while we can.

Mr. President, the broadcasters have a right to do their best to make a fair profit under our free enterprise system. But they also have an obligation, a higher obligation, as the law states, to operate "in the public interest." After all, they are licensed by the American people to use their airways as a public service. They have not been granted their broadcasting opportunities by divine right. Congress can alter the requirements for use of the airways any time it is in the public interest to do so. And given the vital importance of reopening our political system to maximum competition, now is clearly such a time.

Thus, Mr. President, I am quite hopeful that the Campaign Broadcast Reform Act will achieve the speedy consideration it deserves, for nothing less than the integrity of our historic belief in democracy is at stake. Technology has radically changed the demands of campaigning for public office in just the past decade. We must adapt our laws and practices to deal with these changes if we are to succeed in preserving the open character of our political system. And let us remember that this free competition has produced some of the greatest statesmen the world has ever known—men of unlimited talent, but very limited means—men such as Abraham Lincoln. If he were to enter the public arena today, for example, I doubt if he would be able to survive.

Such a situation is obviously unhealthy. The responsibility to do something about it is ours. We cannot shirk it any longer. If we do not have the wisdom and courage to reform our political system from within there are many who stand ready to overthrow it from without. Public confidence can only be maintained by reforming obvious inequities. The remedy offered by the Campaign Broadcast Reform Act is a mild one, but it is reasonable and should prove effective. Let us take this opportunity for moderate reform before more extreme measures are the only viable alternative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Campaign Broadcast Reform Act be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2876) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide candidates for congressional offices with certain opportunities to purchase broadcast time from television broadcasting stations, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2876

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Television Broadcast Time for Candidates for Congressional Offices

"SEC. 331. (a) For purpose of this section—

"(1) The term 'broadcast area' means the A contour area of a television broadcasting station, as determined under regulations of the Commission.

"(2) The term 'legally qualified candidate' includes only candidates in general elections.

"(3) The term 'Representative in Congress' includes the Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(4) The term 'television broadcasting station' means a television broadcasting station operating on a channel regularly assigned by the Commission under this Act to the television broadcasting station's community.

"(b) Each legally qualified candidate for the office of Representative in Congress or United States Senator shall be provided, in accordance with subsection (d), opportunities to purchase broadcast time from the television broadcasting stations required under subsection (c) to provide such opportunities to such candidate.

"(c)(1) Each legally qualified candidate for the office of Representative in Congress elected from a congressional district shall be provided opportunities to purchase broadcast time from each television broadcasting station located in such district and from any other television broadcasting station whose broadcast area population comprises at least one-third of the population of such district.

"(2) Each legally qualified candidate for the office of Representative in Congress elected at large from a State or for the office of United States Senator from a State shall be provided opportunities to purchase broadcast time from each television broadcasting station located in such State and from any other television broadcasting station which has at least one-fifth of its broadcast area population residing in such State.

"(3) The population of each State, congressional district, and broadcast area shall be determined by the Commission on the basis of the latest available census information from the Department of Commerce.

"(d) The opportunities to purchase broadcast time required to be provided by television broadcasting stations under this section shall be provided as follows:

"(1) The broadcast time required to be provided shall be provided during the five-week period ending on the date of each general election held to select Representatives in Congress and United States Senators. Not later than the 60th day preceding the date of such election (or if a primary election to select candidates for such election is to be held after such 60th day, not later than the 42nd day preceding the date of such election), each legally qualified candidate in such election for the office of Representative in Congress or the office of United States Senator may apply (in such manner as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe) to any television broadcasting station, required under subsection (c) to provide opportunities to purchase broadcast time to such candidate, to purchase the broadcast time described in paragraph (2) of this subsection. Not later than the 40th day preceding the date of such election, each television broadcasting station which has received any application under the preceding sentence to purchase broadcast time shall provide each applicant with a schedule of the broadcast time which may be purchased by the applicant. Such schedule shall be made in accordance with the requirements of this section.

"(2)(A) Each legally qualified candidate for the office of Representative in Congress shall, with respect to each general election in which he is running, be entitled to purchase—

"(i) Sixty one-minute announcements or the equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commission), and

"(ii) A thirty-minute, program-length broadcast or the equivalent not to be used in segments shorter than five minutes in length (as determined under regulations of the Commission) from each television broadcasting station required under subsection (c) to provide opportunities to such candidate to purchase broadcast time.

"(B) Each legally qualified candidate for the office of United State Senator shall, with respect to each general election in which he is running, be entitled to purchase—

"(i) One hundred and twenty one-minute segments of broadcast time (or the equivalent as determined under regulations of the Commission), and

"(ii) A thirty-minute program-length broadcast or the equivalent not to be used in segments shorter than five minutes in length (as determined under regulations of the Commission) from each television broadcasting station required under subsection (c) to provide opportunities to such candidate to purchase broadcast time.

"(C) If more than one television broadcasting station is required under subsection (c) to provide a candidate with opportunities to purchase broadcast time, all the television broadcast stations so required to provide such candidate with such opportunities shall divide equally among themselves (in accordance with regulations of the Commission) the responsibility to provide to the candidate the opportunity to purchase broadcast time described in clause (i) of subparagraph (A) or (B) of this paragraph, as the case may be.

"(3) Each candidate shall be given the opportunity to purchase broadcast time during the continuous three hour period of each broadcast day which reflects the highest published rates of the station, or during such other period as the candidate may request.

"(4) The rates charged a candidate for broadcast time purchased under this section shall not exceed—

(A) Thirty per centum of the charges made for comparable use of such station for other purposes for the announcements described in clause (i) of subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2), as the case may be.

"(B) 20 per centum of the charges made for comparable use of such station for other purposes for the program time described in clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2), as the case may be.

"The Commission shall have the authority to require licensees to keep such records as may be necessary to determine the sale price of broadcast time during the four month period preceding the date of the general election. Upon application of a candidate, the Commission shall promptly review the station's records to determine whether the station is in compliance with this Act and take such steps as may be necessary to bring the station into compliance."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by Sec. 1 of this Act shall be applied in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 315 of the Communications Act of 1934.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by Sec. 1 of this Act shall apply with respect to candidates in general elections held on or after the 180th day following the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, at a time when there is considerable and laudable interest in widening participation in our electoral process, soaring campaign costs work in the opposite direction.

It has been estimated that in 1968 candidates for public office at all levels spent about $300 million campaigning, up $100 million from the previous presidential election year.

Similar expenditures in presidential election years between 1952 and 1964 only rose from $140 million to $200 million.

Inflation accounts for only part of that increase.

One major increase came from greater use of political broadcasts as a campaign tool, in Senate and House races, as well as in presidential elections.

The Federal Communication Commission reported that $34.6 million were spent on all political broadcasting in 1964. In 1968, that figure was $58.9 million.

Almost 65 percent of that total went into television.

Clearly, television campaigning, with its many pluses and minuses, is not only here to stay, but reliance on TV as a major campaign strategy undoubtedly will continue to increase.

As campaign costs soar, the search for wealthy candidates and wealthy contributors intensifies.

Reliance on just one segment of society undermines the basis for representative and responsive government.

Statistics emphasize the narrowness of participation represented by political contributors.

It has been estimated than only 5 percent or less of our population contribute to political campaigns.

It has been estimated that only 1 percent of our people contribute 90 percent of all political funds.

The Nation is faced, then, with a serious problem of maintaining representative and responsive governments, both as to making possible races for public office by candidates of low and moderate incomes and as to supporting political campaigns which reach and inform as many people as possible.

Today, the able Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) and I introduced a bill designed as a small step toward alleviating one aspect of the problem of increasing campaign costs.

The Campaign Broadcast Reform Act of 1969 seeks to lower the cost of a limited amount of television campaigning.

The rationale for starting with television is:

First. The airways belong to the public.

Second. TV time is a major campaign cost and will continue to be so.

The Campaign Broadcast Reform Act would work this way:

In the 5 weeks prior to a general election only, a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives could purchase the equivalent of 60 1-minute prime-time spots at 30 percent of the commercial rate, and the equivalent of one 30-minute prime-time program at 20 percent of the regular commercial rate.

Senate candidates could purchase the equivalent of 120 1-minute prime-time spots at 30 percent of the regular commercial rate and the equivalent of a 30-minute program at 20 percent of the prime-time rate.

At the discretion of the candidate, spot time could be divided among 1-minute ads and ads of shorter duration and purchased at various times. The cost of the package would be limited to the cost of 60 1-minute or 120 1-minute prime-time spots.

Similarly, program time would be divided at the discretion of the candidate, though programs would have to be at least 5 minutes long.

Discounted time purchased would have to be divided equally among all stations in a House district or a State. Also, out-of-district or out-of-State stations serving prescribed percentages of an area's population also would have to accept an equal share of the discounted time.

The bill does not limit a candidate from purchasing additional time, nor does it interfere with billing procedures involving political candidates.

The bill also is designed not to raise questions of equal time.

Again, the intent of the Campaign Broadcast Reform Act of 1969 is to help provide all candidates with access to a most important campaign tool.

It is my hope that not only will this bill be considered on its own merits, but that its introduction will generate needed study of ways to open the opportunity to run for public office to all persons, regardless of the degree of affluence of the candidate or of his backers.

Only in that way can we insure that the high cost of campaigning does not thwart efforts to insure that our Government elected by the people represents and is responsive to all people.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, the rapidly growing cost of political campaigns poses a serious threat to our traditional political values and system. In the past few years the impact of technological developments on our campaigning has become obvious to all. The need for a good television image and the use of TV documentaries and television spots similar to those used to sell commercial products have become accepted parts of our system of choosing our leaders and legislators.

Besides becoming a dominant influence in our elections, TV has had a profound effect on the cost of running for political office. For example, in 1952, $3 million was spent for TV time by all candidates; by 1968, this figure reached $27.4 million. These figures do not include the considerable cost of the production of TV materials, which is estimated to run 25 percent or more of the cost for time.

In Virginia, we have just completed a Democratic primary election in which record amounts were spent by the candidates on their campaigns, much of which was for TV time and production. For example, one candidate spent about a quarter of a million dollars on TV time and production, a figure in excess of the total amount spent by any previous Virginia candidate in a primary or a general election.

Recently released figures on campaign costs in 1968 indicate that the percentage spent for TV time was greater than in previous years. Whatever figures are used, one point is clear—campaign costs are increasing rapidly and the cost of TV time is a significant factor in the increase.

As campaign costs increase, it is becoming more and more difficult for candidates without personal wealth or the backing of powerful interest groups to run for high office. Such a situation is totally unacceptable in a system such as ours.

It is clear that the current election laws are ineffective in limiting the cost of campaigning and that Congress must take steps to bring the cost of campaigning within reason. The bill introduced today by Senators HART and PEARSON represents a modest first step in that direction. I join in its sponsorship as an expression of my concern over complaints—heard with increasing frequency—that only the independently wealthy, or those backed by well-to-do special interests, can afford to seek public office. I hope the bill will serve as a vehicle for further refinements leading to limitations on campaign spending and disclosure.

Congress must act to restore the public's faith in our Government. Broader participation in political campaigns, together with a reduction in campaign costs and financial disclosure by public officials, would serve to eliminate doubt and suspicion about the activities of people in government, and those aspiring to public office.

The bill provides for reduced rates for TV time for candidates for the House and Senate, and does so in the simplest manner possible and without imposing an undue burden on any one station. Simply, the bill provides that each candidate for the Senate and House of Representatives, in a general election, would be able to buy a certain amount of time at a reduction from the regular commercial rate.

Candidates for the Senate would be able to buy up to 120 minutes of spot time to be used in segments of 1 minute or less at 30 percent of the regular rate. Candidates for the House would be able to buy up to 60 minutes of this time. The time would be divided among the stations serving a significant portion of the candidate's State or district. In addition, each candidate would be able to buy a 30-minute program or its equivalent on each station servicing his State or district at 20 percent of the regular rate.

Mr. President, I would hope that the simplicity of the bill would be a start toward a more complete limitation and control upon campaign costs, particularly those involved in television. In view of this, the bill is worthy of consideration by the Senate. I hope early hearings will focus the Senate's attention upon this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

JOINT COMMISSION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

A communication from the President of the United States strongly urging prompt action on S.J. Res. 119 and provision of sufficient funds to cover the modest expenses of the U.S. Section of the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of agreements signed under Public Law 480 in July and August 1969 for foreign currencies (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON VALUE OF PROPERTY, SUPPLIES, AND COMMODITIES PROVIDED BY THE BERLIN MAGISTRAT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the value of property, supplies, and commodities provided by the Berlin Magistrat for the quarter April 1, to June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING A STUDY OF ESSENTIAL RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, to authorize a study of essential railroad passenger service by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION IMPROVING AND CLARIFYING CERTAIN LAWS AFFECTING THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve and clarify certain laws affecting the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of financial statements of the Federal Housing Administration for the fiscal year 1968, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated September 9, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the potential for savings by reduction of aircraft engine procurement, Department of the Navy and Department of the Air Force, dated September 9, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the enforcement of sanitary, facility, and moisture requirements at federally inspected poultry plants, Consumer and Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, dated September 10, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on review of U.S. assistance programs in Tunisia (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION MODIFYING THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SANTA FE, CIBOLA, AND CARSON NATIONAL FORESTS, N. MEX.

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to modify the boundaries of the Santa Fe, Cibola, and Carson National Forests in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON COMMISSARY ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department on commissary activities outside the continental United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic

Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORT ON FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Attorney General on the Foreign Agents Registration Act, for the calendar year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 560. A bill to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site (Rept. No. 91-396).

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO LIMIT THE RATES OF INTEREST OR DIVIDENDS PAYABLE ON TIME AND SAVINGS DEPOSITS AND ACCOUNTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 91-397)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably an original joint resolution (S.J. Res. 149) to extend for 3 months the authority to limit the rates of interest or dividends payable on time and savings deposits and accounts, and I submit a report thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar; and the report will be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Jack W. Lydman, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Malaysia;

Charles T. Cross, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Singapore;

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uruguay;

Robert M. Sayre, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Panama;

Douglas MacArthur II, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iran;

Robinson McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Kenya;

Charles W. Yost, of New York, William B. Buffum, of New York, Dante B. Fascell, U.S. Representative from the State of Florida, J. Irving Whalley, U.S. Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and Shirley Temple Black, of California, to be representatives of the United States of America to the 24th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

Christopher H. Phillips, of New York, Glenn A. Olds, of New York, Rita E. Hauser, of New York, William T. Coleman, of Pennsylvania, and Joseph E. Johnson, of New Jersey, to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 24th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Leonard E. Alderson, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Wisconsin.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED OR REPORTED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced or reported, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred or placed on the calendar, as follows:

By Mr. PEARSON (for himself, Mr. HART, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PERCY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SAXBE, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPONG, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2876. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide candidates for congressional offices with certain opportunities to purchase broadcast time from television broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. PEARSON when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2877. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Sandolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2878. A bill for the relief of Donato Losenno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS:

S. 2879. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the issuance of certificates of release of tax liens and the filing of such certificates in the same offices in which the notices of such liens are filed; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2880. A bill to provide that time spent by a Federal employee in a travel status shall be considered as hours of employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2881. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 in order to permit eligible households living in remote areas of Alaska to use food stamp coupons for the purchase of ammunition; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS when he introduced the bills appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 2882. A bill to amend Public Law 394, 84th Congress, to authorize the construction of supplemental irrigation facilities for the Yuma Mesa Irrigation District, Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONTOYA (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2883. A bill to provide for the imposition of a duty on excessive imports of potassium chloride or muriate of potash; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. MONTOYA when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 2884. A bill to provide for the duty-free entry under bond of certain plastic bags to be used as containers for exporting organic fertilizer from the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 2885. A bill to establish an orderly trade in textiles and in leather footwear; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. HOLLINGS when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2886. A bill to change the names of certain projects for navigation and other purposes on the Arkansas River; to the Committee on Public Works.

(The remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON) (by request):

S. 2887. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, to authorize a study of essential railroad passenger service by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SPONG, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for payment to local educational agencies of full entitlements pursuant to the provisions of title I of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(The remarks of Mr. MONTOYA when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S.J. Res. 149. A joint resolution to extend for 3 months the authority to limit the rates of interest or dividends payable on time and savings deposits and accounts; placed on the calendar.

(The remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he reported the joint resolution appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2879—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO RELEASE OF TAX LIENS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have today introduced a bill as an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which would require the issuance of certificates of release of tax liens and the filing of such certificates by the Internal Revenue Service.

When the Internal Revenue Service files a lien upon an individual or business, that lien is recorded.

When the lien is satisfied a release of the lien is recorded only if the expense of that release is borne by the taxpayer.

This procedure works a hardship on owners of real property who have had a lien filed against that property. In order

to clear title, the owner of the property must file the release of lien at his own expense.

In many cases the expense is really borne by subsequent owners of real property who have the burden of removing the cloud from the title which was originally created by the Internal Revenue Service lien.

The Federal Government should be in no greater position than anyone else in regard to removing clouds from titles created by liens. The legislation I have introduced today would require the Federal Government to take the necessary simple measures to remove the cloud created by a tax lien by filing a certificate of release of lien in the same office in which the notice of such lien was originally filed.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2879) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the issuance of certificates of release of tax liens and the filing of such certificates in the same offices in which the notices of such liens are filed, introduced by Mr. STEVENS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2879

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of section 6325 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to release of lien or discharge of property) are amended by striking out "may issue" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "shall issue".

(b) Subsection (f)(1) of such section is amended by striking out "if a certificate is issued pursuant to this section by the Secretary or his delegate and is filed in the same office as the notice of lien to which it relates (if such notice of lien has been filed) such certificate" and inserting in lieu thereof "a certificate which is issued pursuant to this section and is filed as provided in subsection (g) (if filing is required under such subsection)".

(c) Subsection (g) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Filing of Certificates and Notices.—If the notice of lien to which a certificate or notice issued pursuant to this section relates has been filed, such certificate or notice shall be filed by the Secretary or his delegate, within ten days from the date of issuance, in the same office in which the notice of lien was filed. If the notice of lien to which such certificate or notice relates was filed in the office designated by State law under section 6323(f) (or in the office of Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia) and if such certificate or notice may not be filed in such office, then such certificate or notice shall be effective if filed in the office of the clerk of the United States district court for the judicial district in which such office is situated."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than thirty days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. 2880—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO TIME SPENT IN TRAVEL STATUS BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill that will treat that time spent in travel status by a Federal employee as hours of employment.

Too often in the past a Federal employee has been required to travel, while on Government business, on his own time. Many instances are documented in which an employee is required to be in a distant city on a Monday morning, necessitating his traveling on Sunday and many times on Saturdays in order to make his business appointments.

In many areas, such as my home State of Alaska, it is difficult to arrange convenient travel schedules to allow travel during normal working hours. In these cases, in order to carry out his job responsibilities, the employee must travel on a weekend or after regularly designated working hours.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be inconsistent to require an employee to sacrifice his personal time, time that could be spent with his family and friends, in order to meet Federal employment commitments.

My bill will correct this glaring deficiency by counting that time spent in travel status, outside of normal working hours, as hours of employment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2880) to provide that time spent by a Federal employee in a travel status shall be considered as hours of employment, introduced by Mr. STEVENS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2880

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5542(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) time spent in a travel status away from the official station of an employee is hours of employment."

(b) The last sentence of section 5544(a) of such title is amended to read as follows: "Time spent in a travel status away from the official duty station of an employee subject to this subsection is hours of work."

SEC. 2. Section 3571(e) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Time spent in a travel status away from the official duty station of an employee is hours of employment."

S. 2881—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill that will amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to allow certain eligible households in my home State of Alaska to use food stamp coupons for the purchase of ammunition.

The purpose of the bill is to allow those Alaskans in the remote parts of the State who rely on subsistence hunting for the bulk of their diet to purchase rifle and shotgun ammunition for this purpose. In these areas where the cost of living can be 50 to 100 percent higher than Anchorage—and Anchorage has a cost of living 25 to 50 percent higher than Washington, D.C.—it is imperative that we do everything possible to assist these people to obtain an adequate diet.

Mr. President, when a person pays 30 cents for a small can of milk, 50 cents for a box of salt, or $11 for 50 pounds of flour from a village store and must still pay a high freight rate to have the staples delivered to his homesite, something must be done. My bill will help relieve this tremendous economic burden by allowing the purchase of ammunition with food stamp coupons. It is obvious that by allowing these Alaskans to purchase ammunition to shoot game for subsistence they will be able to supplement their basic diet to assure an adequate food intake.

The IRS in a recent administrative order has recognized the unique Alaskan problem by allowing Alaskans in remote areas to purchase rifle and shotgun ammunition through the mail. It would seem that we should carry this one step further and allow them to purchase the needed ammunition for subsistence hunting with food stamp coupons.

My bill would allow this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2881) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 in order to permit eligible households living in remote areas of Alaska to use food stamp coupons for the purchase of ammunition, introduced by Mr. STEVENS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2881

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"AUTHORITY OF CERTAIN ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS IN ALASKA TO USE COUPONS FOR THE PURCHASE OF AMMUNITION

"SEC. 17. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, members of eligible households living in the State of Alaska shall be permitted, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to purchase ammunition with coupons issued under this Act if the Secretary determines that (1) such households are located in an area of the State which make it extremely difficult for members of such households to reach retail food stores, and (2) such households depend to a substantial extent on the use of firearms to kill game for food. As used in this section, the term 'ammunition' means ammunition for rifles and shotguns."

S. 2883—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL CURBING EXCESSIVE POTASH IMPORTS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the agricultural production of the United States is looked to as a model by the entire world. The quality and abundance of our food supply is a credit to the American farmer and a tribute to the modern science and technology which this country has developed in order to feed an ever-growing population in the United States. I think we would all agree that to place this production capability in jeopardy by making it dependent on the will of a foreign nation—no matter how amiable that nation may be or how cordial our mutual relationships—would be utter folly. Yet this is just what is occurring.

We are doing this by allowing our domestic potash production to be jeopardized—by excessive imports—and thus presenting this country with a situation wherein we could become totally dependent on Canada and other countries for our supply of potash.

Potash is one of three primary plant-food elements, the other two being nitrogen and phosphorous. Potash is an element for which there is no substitute, and without which most food crop plants cannot flourish. Since potash is one of the three essential ingredients of fertilizers, it is, therefore, the key to dependable crop production.

My logic then is this: Without potash the farm community cannot maintain or increase the productivity of our land to match the food requirement of our growing population, estimated to be 300 million persons by the year 2000. It is just that simple.

I find it unthinkable that this Nation could knowingly allow an industry so vitally important to our well-being and national security as our domestic potash industry to become economically atrophied. It may behoove us to recall the reasons why our domestic potash industry was founded in the first place.

Prior to World War I, American agriculture was entirely dependent on foreign sources for its potash. When the war cut off these supplies, an intensive search was made to locate sources in this country. As a result, potash began to be produced here in 1916 and production continued on a moderate scale at Trona, Calif., from brines of Searles Lake, even when imports were resumed.

In 1931, shipments were made from the newly discovered potash deposits near Carlsbad, N. Mex. Production increased rapidly until at the outbreak of World War II about half of the potash consumed here was of American origin. Since 1938, brines of the Saldura Marsh in Utah, and subsequently brines in eastern Michigan, also have been used as sources of potash.

Imports were again cut off during World War II, while the demand soared due to the huge war-food program and intensified industrial activity. The American potash industry immediately expanded its mines and refineries to meet these needs and continued to increase production in the postwar period. This production is now in jeopardy, and prompt, aggressive action must be taken if we are to safeguard an industry whose importance to our national interest is all too clear from past history.

As I pointed out to my colleagues in the Senate 2 years ago and again last January, new discoveries of potash in Canada have been flooding the U.S. markets, steadily squeezing out our domestic supplies. Total foreign imports of potash have jumped from 9 percent of domestic consumption in 1960 to 54 percent in 1968. Over the 9 years from 1960 to 1968, total imports of potash into the United States averaged about 30.5 percent of our domestic consumption for those 9 years. It is interesting to note further that potash imports excluding Canadian imports have remained relatively constant, totaling approximately 350,000 tons per year in raw mineral, while Canadian imports have jumped astronomically from 3 tons in 1961 to 3,309,142 tons in 1968 of the mineral known as potassium chloride.

Mr. President, some American potash producers have found it more profitable to operate in Canada. The primary reason is because of an extensive body of high grade, low cost ore, making possible lower production costs. This advantage, plus special inducements given by the Canadian Government to Canadian potash producers, creates a difficult competitive situation for the producers in Carlsbad, where our domestic production is concentrated. Consequently, some of our domestic producers are phasing out their operations in the United States and moving their operations to Canada. To compound the situation, potash imports are duty free.

There is a human side to this story also, my colleagues. Plants in the Carlsbad area are laying off workers by the hundreds due to mine shutdowns and plant closings. In the year between June 1967 and June 1968, alone more than 1,400 workers were put out of work in the Carlsbad area, and all because of potash imports. Many of these workers are over 50 years of age, and their previous education has been in one field—potash mining. It is late in their lives to retrain them for other jobs, and even if they could be retrained, there are no other jobs available to them in the area.

The advent of the Canadian potash industry is, to a degree, a welcome development to our country in that it can supplement our domestic requirements if and when we have a shortage of supply; we are not advocating a total restriction on imports—but what we do say is that no force within our control should be allowed to render us without a domestic industry. The close and friendly relationship that has been maintained by the United States and our good neighbor to the North is indeed a pattern of excellence that could be followed by other contiguous nations. But in spite of our friendship with Canada, it must be realized that it is not in the best interest of any nation to be dependent upon another for the production of its food supply.

Mr. President, 2 years ago I introduced a bill in this body to place a limit on imports of potash into this country. My bill then would have allowed for up to 25 percent of our domestic needs to be imported from foreign sources. I stated in introducing that measure, and again during hearings before the Senate Finance Committee in October of 1967, that if my measure was not enacted promptly that a domestic industry would be destroyed. Regrettably my import quota bill was not enacted and my warnings are becoming prophetic. A domestic industry is being destroyed.

I reintroduced my import quota bill again this session—in January of this year. I intended to push vigorously for its enactment and felt that I had the force of the history of unfortunate mine closings to support my contention. But what has happened? The administration, in a report from the U.S. Tariff Commission on May 6, 1969, to the Senate Finance Committee on my bill, S. 344, while openly acknowledging the plight of our domestic industry, nonetheless has reserved judgment on the measure. Thus, without the open support of the administration, and given the number of import quota bills pending before Congress, being practical, one would have to surmise that my measure stood little chance of passage soon enough to help our domestic industry. Thus, another alternative or alternatives must be sought.

There is one small ray of hope for our domestic industry short of legislative action. The U.S. Treasury Department, at the request of Senator ANDERSON and myself, initiated an investigation 2 years ago into possible violations by potash importers of the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921, as amended. Finally, after constant prodding and urging on our part, the Department has concluded their investigation and has informed me that—

> This merchandise (potash) is being, or is likely to be, sold at less than fair value within the meaning of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended (19 U.S.C. 160 *et seq.*). The cases, therefore, have been referred to the United States Tariff Commission for determination as to injury.

The determination was with reference to potash imports from Canada, France, and West Germany.

Mr. President, I think it is interesting to note that in the case of one exporter from Canada, International Minerals and Chemical (Canada) Ltd.—IMC—"less than 25 percent of its merchandise was sold in the home market." Mr. President, how can any industry hope to survive with this type of unfair competition from foreign importers? No industry can. You have an exporter that sets up shop in Canada where it gets special incentives from the Canadian Government, mines potash in Canada, helps the Canadian economy, pays Canadian taxes, then turns around and exports over 75 percent of its product into the United States because we place no restrictions whatsoever, and it does so at less than fair market value. Our domestic potash industry is at the mercy of foreign producers. This is totally incomprehensible. No other sovereign government would stand still for this sort of cutthroat competition from a foreign source.

It is to be hoped that the Tariff Commission within the 90-day period that it has been given to determine the extent

of injury to the domestic potash industry from foreign imports will take appropriate action to curb this situation. I vigorously urge them to do so and serve notice that I will be following their proceedings extremely close. If remedial action cannot be enacted by the Tariff Commission in this situation and under these circumstances, then I feel we need no further proof that the machinery which has been established to deal with these situations is not adequate and cannot meet the purposes for which it was established. Under such circumstances—that is, if the Tariff Commission fails to take remedial action or fails to take adequate action, then I feel that it is then up to the Congress to enact additional legislation.

For this reason, Mr. President, and because the legislation which I had previously introduced, S. 344, is not receiving the active support of the administration at this time, I am today introducing a bill on behalf of myself and Senators HOLLINGS, MOSS, SMITH, and YOUNG of Ohio, which bill would not prohibit nor place a limitation on the volume of potash which can be imported into the United States. Instead, this bill would simply establish a limit on the volume of potash which can be imported duty free. Any amounts over and above that limit would be assessed an ad valorem tax.

Mr. President, this bill would allow up to 30 percent of our domestic needs to be supplied from foreign sources and be imported duty free into the United States. I repeat that up to 30 percent of our domestic needs in any one year could still be imported duty free under my proposal—duty free, just as now is the case. When our domestic demand increases, the amount that can be imported duty free would also increase correspondingly, subject to the 30-percent limitation. As I stated earlier in my statement, during the 9-year period from 1960 to 1968, total imports of potash into the United States averaged approximately 30.5 percent of our domestic needs. Thus, the 30-percent limitation on duty-free imports that I have provided for in my bill seems more than judicious.

In addition, Mr. President, I emphasize that imports into the United States would not be limited to 30 percent of our domestic needs. Foreign sources could still continue importing potash into the United States without limit. They could supply any volume whatsoever they choose to. However, for any amounts imported over 30 percent of our domestic needs for any one year, there would be assessed a 40-percent ad valorem tax on such imports—only on the amount that exceeds 30 percent of our domestic needs.

Mr. President, I cannot see anything unfair about this proposal. At least not as far as foreign potash producers are concerned. Perhaps it is unfair to our domestic potash industry because it is so liberal in its coverage. It is far more liberal than S. 344 which I introduced earlier and which would place a 25 percent ceiling on the amount of our domestic needs that could be imported. However, it is a measure which the domestic industry feels it can live with and which because of its liberal terms, I am hopeful this session of Congress can take action on. However, it can still be hoped that the U.S. Tariff Commission will recommend the necessary action during the proceedings it presently has underway, so that perhaps this legislation may not be required. In the event it fails to do so, however, I shall press vigorously for enactment of this proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill which I have introduced on behalf of myself and Senators HOLLINGS, MOSS, SMITH, and YOUNG of Ohio, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2883) to provide for the imposition of a duty on excessive imports of potassium chloride or muriate of potash, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2883

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) schedule 4, part 11, of the Tariff Schedules of the United States is amended by striking out item 480.50 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"	Potassium chloride or muriate of potash:		
480.50	In any calendar year prior to the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of the quantity proclaimed by the President for such year under headnote 2	Free	Free
480.51	Other	40% ad val.	40% ad val. ,,

(b) The headnote to schedule 4, part 11, of such Schedules is amended—

(1) by striking out "headnote" in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "headnotes"; and

(2) by adding after headnote 1 the following new headnote:

"2. (a) Before the beginning of the calendar year 1970 and of each subsequent calendar year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and certify to the President—

"(i) the estimated domestic production and estimated domestic consumption of potassium chloride or muriate of potash during such calendar year, and

"(ii) the estimated domestic production of potassium chloride or muriate of potash during the calendar year in which such determination is being made.

"(b) On or before January 1, 1970, and on or before January 1 of each subsequent calendar year, the President shall, by proclamation, fix the quantity of potassium chloride or muriate of potash which may be imported free of duty during the calendar year under item 480.50. The quantity so proclaimed for any year shall be the greater of—

"(i) the quantity by which the estimated domestic consumption during such year exceeds the estimated domestic production during such year (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture under paragraph (a) (i)), or

"(ii) a quantity equal to 30 percent of the estimated domestic production determined by the Secretary of Agriculture under paragraph (a) (ii).

If during any calendar year, the actual domestic production or domestic consumption is greater or less than the estimates determined under paragraph (a) (i), the President may, by proclamation, modify any quantity previously proclaimed for such year."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1970.

S. 2885—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH AN ORDERLY TRADE IN TEXTILES AND IN LEATHER FOOTWEAR

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, for many years our Nation has followed a foreign trade policy based on the myth that our capital-intensive industries are able to compete with world trade and that their technological sophistication will enable them to supply jobs for all the workers who have been displaced by rising import competition. Experience clearly indicates, however, that this is not the case. We have been witnessing an erosion of jobs and job opportunities in labor-intensive industries because our national trade policy exposes these industries to unrelieved pressure in rising imports without hope for limitation. The need is urgent. We must promptly undertake a realistic foreign trade policy that would preserve for our labor-intensive industries opportunity to participate in the growth of the American market with foreign products. Unless such action is taken, we are sentencing our basic manufacturing industries to economic doom and their workers to insecure and uncertain futures.

The disastrous impact of imports has been graphically demonstrated by the distressed positions of the textile industry and the domestic footwear industry. With 2,525,000 workers the textile mill products, apparel, and manmade-fiber-producing industries are by far one of the Nation's largest employers of workers in the manufacturing industries. In 1968 textile mill products experienced a foreign trade deficit of $437.3 million. In apparel and related products, the trade deficit was $674.5 million. Neither my State nor the Nation can afford to ignore the fact that the U.S. foreign trade in products like or directly competitive with such articles is ever increasing our foreign trade deficit.

In 1968 our Nation had a balance of trade deficit of $377.3 million in footwear. In that regard the domestic consumption of leather footwear amounted to 804 million pairs of shoes of which imports supplied 175.4 million pairs of shoes. These imports were equivalent to 21.8 percent of the domestic consumption in 1968 where it was only 5.8 percent in 1961.

Today the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) and I are introducing a bill calling for maintaining orderly trade in textile articles and leather footwear. In addition, in the national interest our legislation will provide for revision of the administration of title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to assist domestic industries, firms and

groups of workers caused or threatened with serious injury by increased imports.

Mr. President, the time has come for Members of this body to take the initiative in combating the serious problems created by excessive imports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2885) to establish an orderly trade in textiles and in leather footwear, introduced by Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself and Mr. COTTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2886—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL CHANGING THE NAMES OF CERTAIN PROJECTS FOR NAVIGATION AND OTHER PURPOSES ON THE ARKANSAS RIVER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to change the names of certain projects for navigation and other purposes on the Arkansas River.

Navigation on the Arkansas River from Oklahoma through Arkansas to the river's junction with the Mississippi will be the result of the dreams and efforts of many men. No men, however, worked more tirelessly and faithfully for this navigation project than my senior colleague from Arkansas, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, and our late colleague from Oklahoma, Senator Robert Kerr. Consequently, my bill would honor these Senators by naming this waterway the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Project. In addition, my bill would honor three former Members of the House of Representatives from Arkansas who worked diligently for the development of the Arkansas River project—W. F. Norrell, Brooks Hays, and J. W. Trimble.

A similar bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representatives MILLS, PRYOR of Arkansas, HAMMERSCHMIDT, and ALEXANDER. I hope that this legislation may be enacted during the present session of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2886) to change the names of certain projects for navigation and other purposes on the Arkansas River, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2887—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL AUTHORIZING A STUDY OF ESSENTIAL RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference on behalf of Senator MAGNUSON and myself and by request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a bill to amend section 13(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, to authorize a study of essential railroad passenger service by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2887) to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, to authorize a study of essential railroad passenger service by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2887

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13a of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 13a) is amended to read as follows:

"13a(1) A carrier or carriers subject to this part, if their rights with respect to the discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, of the operation or service of any passenger train or ferry operating between a point in one State, the District of Columbia, or a foreign country and a point in any other State or in the District of Columbia, are subject to any provision of the constitution or statutes of any State or any regulation or order of (or are the subject of any proceeding pending before) any court or an administrative or regulatory agency of any State, may, but shall not be required to, file with the Commission, and upon such filing shall mail to the Governor of each State in which such train or ferry is operated, and post in every station, depot, or other facility served thereby, including stations, depots, or facilities on the property of other carriers which share in the operation of said train, notice at least sixty days in advance of any such proposed discontinuance or change. The carrier or carriers filing such notice may, upon the expiration of, but not during, the notice period, discontinue or change any such operation or service pursuant to such notice except as otherwise ordered by the Commission pursuant to this paragraph, the laws or constitution of any State, or the decision or order of, or the pendency of any proceeding before, any court or State authority to the contrary notwithstanding. Upon the filing of such notice the Commission shall have authority during said sixty days' notice period, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, to enter upon an investigation of the proposed discontinuance or change. Upon the institution of such investigation, the Commission, by its investigation order served upon the carrier or carriers affected thereby at least twenty days prior to the day on which such discontinuance or change would otherwise become effective, may require such train or ferry to be continued in operation or service, in whole or in part, pending hearing and decision in such investigation, but not for a longer period than seven months beyond the date when such discontinuance or change would otherwise have become effective; except that the Commission may further require such train or ferry to be continued in operation or service, in whole or in part, for a period of no longer than two months beyond the date specified in its investigation order, pending completion of the investigation or the Commission's determination of any petition or petitions for reconsideration of its decision and order in such investigation. However, if during the notice period, the carrier or carriers discontinue or change, in whole or in part, the operation or service of any train or ferry, the Commission shall retain jurisdiction to enter upon an investigation of the change or discontinuance and may require the immediate restoration or continuance of operation or service of such train or ferry until the expiration of the notice period. When an investigation by the Commission is instituted under this section, the carrier or carriers filing such notice shall have the burden of establishing that public convenience and necessity permit the proposed discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, and that the continued operation or service of such train or ferry without discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, will unduly burden interstate or foreign commerce. If, after hearing in such investigation, whether concluded before or after such discontinuance or change has become effective, the Commission finds that the public convenience and necessity permits the proposed discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, and that the continued operation or service of such train or ferry without discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, will unduly burden interstate or foreign commerce, the Commission shall by order permit discontinuance of operation or service of such train or ferry in whole or in part. If, however, the Commission finds that the operation or service of such train or ferry is required by public convenience and necessity and will not unduly burden interstate or foreign commerce, the Commission may by order require the continuance or restoration of operation or service of such train or ferry, in whole or in part, for a period not to exceed one year from the date of such order; except that for two years following the enactment of this proviso, where any trains or ferry proposed to be discontinued represents the last remaining passenger train or ferry operated in either direction by the carrier or carriers proposing such discontinuance, between a point in one State and to a point in another State, the District of Columbia, or a foreign country or from a point in the District of Columbia to a point in any State or a foreign country, the Commission shall require the continuance of the operation or service in question for one year from the date of its order unless it finds that (1) the public convenience and necessity do not require its continuance, or (2) that it finds that continuance of the service or operation in question will impair the ability of carrier or carriers proposing such changes or discontinuance to meet its common carrier responsibilities, considering the overall financial condition of the carrier or carriers in question; except that in the case of operations and service covered by the first proviso, the Commission may attach such conditions to its order, requiring the continuance of the operations or service in question, as are just and reasonable to assure the preservation of a reasonable level of service for the passenger trains or ferries required to be continued; and except that the jurisdiction of the Commission over operations and service subject to the first and second provisos of this sentence shall be exclusive and the carrier or carriers proposing to discontinue or change any operation or service covered by these provisos shall file a notice with the Commission as provided in this paragraph, the laws or constitution of any State, or the decision or order of, or the pendency of any proceeding before, any court or State authority to the contrary notwithstanding. The provisions of this paragraph shall not supersede the laws of any State or the orders or regulations of any administrative or regulatory body of any State applicable to such discontinuance or change unless notice as in this paragraph provided is filed with the Commission. On the expiration of an order by the Commission, after such investigation requiring the continuance or restoration of operation or service, the jurisdiction of any State as to such discontinuance or change

shall no longer be superseded unless the procedure provided by this paragraph shall again be invoked by the carrier or carriers.

"13a(2) Where the discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, by a carrier or carriers subject to this part, of the operation or service of any train or ferry operated wholly within the boundaries of a single State is prohibited by the constitution or statutes of any State or where the State authority having jurisdiction thereof shall have denied an application or petition duly filed with it by said carrier or carriers for authority to discontinue or change, in whole or in part, the operation or service of any such train or ferry or shall not have acted finally on such an application or petition within seven months from the presentation thereof, such carrier or carriers may petition the Commission for authority to effect such discontinuance or change. Upon the filing of such a petition, such discontinuance or change shall be subject to all of the provisions of paragraph (1) of this section to the same extent as if the subject train or ferry operated as described in the first sentence of paragraph (1) of this section. When any petition shall be filed with the Commission under the provisions of this paragraph the Commission shall notify the Governor of the State in which such train or ferry is operated at least thirty days in advance of the hearing provided for in this paragraph, and such hearing shall be held by the Commission in the State in which such train or ferry is operated; and the Commission is authorized to avail itself to the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of the authorities in such State in the performance of its functions under this paragraph.

"13a(3) Any State, administrative or regulatory agency of a State, or person, adversely affected or aggrieved by an order of the Commission entered pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) of this section, may bring suit to obtain judicial review thereof under those provisions of law applicable in the case of suits to enjoin, suspend, or set aside orders of the Commission."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Transportation, acting in cooperation with the Interstate Commerce Commission and other interested Federal agencies and departments, is authorized and directed to undertake and submit, within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, a study of the existing and future potential for intercity railroad passenger service in the United States to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives. In making this study, the Secretary shall consider, among other things:

(1) Existing resources of all types for meeting the Nation's present passenger transportation needs.

(2) Anticipated expansion of those resources by 1975 on the basis of current governmental or private activities (such as the interstate highway program, by Government, and auto production increases, by industry).

(3) The Nation's expected passenger transportation needs, including business, private, and defense movement, in the years 1975 and 1985.

(4) The ability of the existing resources, or resources as expanded by current governmental or private programs, to meet these anticipated needs adequately, efficiently, economically, expeditiously, safely, and comfortably, at least as far ahead as 1975.

(5) The ability of improved railroad passenger service to meet these anticipated needs.

(6) The proper role of the carriers and governmental bodies in developing the required quality and quantity of service, including methods of financing operations which are necessary but not economically viable.

The letter, furnished by Mr. HARTKE, is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1969.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting with this letter a draft bill for your consideration. The bill would amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act and authorize a study of essential railroad passenger service.

As you may recall, the Commission submitted a similar proposal in June 1968, with our report, *Intercity Rail Passenger Service in 1968*, copy attached. Following that, at your request, the Commission undertook an analysis of the costs to various railroads in conducting intercity passenger operations. Our report, *Investigation of Costs of Intercity Rail Passenger Service*, was submitted July 16, 1969.

The need for legislation dealing with the crisis in intercity rail service is even greater today than it was in June 1968. At that time, there were approximately 590 regular intercity trains in operation. That number has now dropped to under 500, and more than 60 of these have been proposed for discontinuance but are currently the subject of investigation.

As a result of our report on *Costs*, there is no longer any question as to the adverse financial impact passenger operations have on the Nation's railroads. Without changes in Federal policy, and a study of the present and future need for intercity rail service recommended by the Commission in 1968, and renewed here, further deterioration in service is imminent. We believe immediate action is essential if a minimum amount of rail service is to be maintained.

We would very much appreciate your assistance in having this bill introduced and hearings scheduled thereon.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA MAE BROWN,
Chairman.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 2146

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of S. 2146, to encourage the flow of credit to urban and rural poverty areas in order to stimulate the rate of economic growth and employment in those areas, and to provide the residents thereof with greater access to consumer, business, and mortgage credit at reasonable rates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2847

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 2847, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of State to participate in the development of a large prototype desalting plant in Israel, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 148—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING SCHOOL AID TO FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I introduce on behalf of myself and Senators ANDERSON, ALLEN, BENNETT, BIBLE, BURDICK, CANNON, CRANSTON, DODD, EAGLETON, FULBRIGHT, GURNEY, HARRIS, HART, MANSFIELD, MONDALE, MOSS, MURPHY, MUSKIE, SPARKMAN, SPONG, STEVENS, THURMOND, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota, a joint resolution to authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to begin making allocations to local educational agencies under the Public Law 874, school aid to federally impacted areas, based upon the full entitlement for that school district instead of upon the much reduced amount in the President's budget request.

As you know, Mr. President, until Congress completes action upon an appropriation measure for an executive agency, that agency can expend funds only at the rate authorized under a continuing resolution. The continuing resolution presently in effect authorizes HEW, among other agencies, to expend funds at last year's rate or the fiscal year 1970 budget request, whichever is the lesser. This procedure has undoubtedly caused much uncertainty and many difficulties in the past on the part of agencies which must function for several months not knowing the total amount of funds they will have to operate with. Inconvenient as this may be, however, we have yet to devise a more efficient approach.

This interim funding procedure, however, is creating havoc with most school budgets and particularly those school districts which have a heavy concentration of Federal activity. We are all familiar with the Public Law 81–874 program which authorizes payments based on a formula to school districts which are federally impacted and which are thus deprived of a tax base for funding their educational system. Congress has decreed time and time again—usually at appropriation time—that we have a responsibility to assist these school districts because the Federal Government is, in effect, depriving them of school taxes. And we have decreed time and time again that we should meet our responsibility fully by paying full entitlement and not merely lipservice as represented by the small amounts that are usually recommended by the executive branch.

This year, Mr. President, the schools with heavy concentrations of Federal activity are feeling a heavy crunch, and unless this resolution is enacted promptly, there is no prospect of any immediate relief for them. We are faced with the prospect of not having final action on the appropriation measure for HEW until late this year. The Senate Appropriations Committee is not even contemplating resuming hearings on the HEW appropriation bill until mid-October.

In the meantime, HEW is bound by

the continuing resolution which only authorizes them to make payments under this program based on last year's appropriation or the President's fiscal year 1970 budget request, whichever is lower.

Unfortunately, the President's fiscal year 1970 budget request is substantially below either full entitlement for fiscal year 1970 or last year's appropriation. Figures supplied me by HEW show that appropriations for fiscal year 1969 were $505,900,000 and full entitlement for fiscal year 1970 totaled $650,594,000, but yet the President's fiscal year 1970 budget request is only $187,000,000. Further, the President's recommended budget would provide for payments only for the so-called A category children and no payments at all for the B category children. The A category children, as you know, are those whose parents both live and work on Federal property. The B category children are those whose parents work but do not live on Federal property. Thus, school districts with B category children in them, would receive no funds under this program whatsoever for their B category children unless Congress acts to amend the President's budget request.

Fortunately, Mr. President, the Congress will probably act to amend the President's budget request. The House has already increased the President's budget request for Public Law 874 funds from $187 million to $585 million. This represents almost full entitlement for each school district for fiscal year 1970 for both A and B category children. I, and others in the Senate, have pledged to seek at least the same level of funding as has the House. I am confident that we will be successful.

However, until we do pass on the HEW appropriations, HEW can allocate funds under the Public Law 874 program, and all other education programs, based on the extremely small Presidential budget request. Thus, unless we move immediately to remedy this, many school districts throughout the country which are dependent on these funds are going to be thrown into a financial panic.

I have secured from HEW a listing of all the applications which they have already received for funding under this program. The listing of applications already received and for which little or no funding will be available unless this resolution is adopted, includes school districts from the west coast to the east coast to the Gulf of Mexico. This, then, is a national problem. Apparently no State is being spared.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a chart showing a State-by-State breakdown of the amounts which school districts in each State are entitled to for fiscal year 1970; the original budget request for fiscal year 1970 submitted by former President Johnson; and the revised budget request submitted by President Nixon. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a second chart, showing by State, the fiscal year 1969 appropriation; the Nixon budget request for fiscal year 1970; and the House amendments for fiscal year 1970.

There being no objection, the charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

TITLES I AND III, PUBLIC LAW 874, AS AMENDED

CHART A

State and outlying areas	1970 full entitlement [1]	1970 original estimate [2]	Amendment	1970 revised estimate [3]
Total	$650,594,000	$300,000,000	−$113,000,000	$187,000,000
Alabama	12,129,000	6,177,000	−3,815,000	2,362,000
Alaska	17,664,000	7,793,000	+6,142,000	13,935,000
Arizona	12,014,000	5,139,000	+1,387,000	6,526,000
Arkansas	3,444,000	1,530,000	−572,000	958,000
California	100,922,000	40,218,000	−14,993,000	25,225,000
Colorado	17,227,000	7,539,000	−4,430,000	3,109,000
Connecticut	4,410,000	1,945,000	−442,000	1,503,000
Delaware	2,303,000	1,756,000	−368,000	1,388,000
Florida	22,231,000	10,201,000	−5,188,000	5,013,000
Georgia	20,606,000	11,575,000	−5,826,000	5,749,000
Hawaii	11,914,000	5,172,000	+569,000	5,741,000
Idaho	3,579,000	1,507,000	−463,000	1,044,000
Illinois	16,537,000	7,217,000	−2,937,000	4,280,000
Indiana	5,673,000	2,491,000	−1,590,000	982,000
Iowa	3,366,000	1,478,000	−1,168,000	310,000
Kansas	11,168,000	4,849,000	−1,547,000	3,302,000
Kentucky	10,402,000	7,277,000	−1,673,000	5,604,000
Louisiana	4,375,000	2,023,000	−1,253,000	770,000
Maine	3,987,000	1,730,000	+483,000	2,213,000
Maryland	32,584,000	13,893,000	−10,506,000	3,387,000
Massachusetts	20,427,000	9,489,000	−3,518,000	5,971,000
Michigan	5,948,000	2,594,000	+258,900	2,852,000
Minnesota	3,736,000	1,658,000	−812,000	846,000
Mississippi	3,397,000	1,483,000	−368,000	1,115,000
Missouri	11,048,000	4,757,000	−2,581,000	2,176,000
Montana	6,052,000	2,521,000	+1,439,000	3,960,000
Nebraska	5,887,000	2,513,000	−227,000	2,286,000
Nevada	$4,583,000	$1,961,000	−$535,000	$1,426,000
New Hampshire	2,745,000	1,213,000	−309,000	904,000
New Jersey	15,358,000	6,771,000	−2,520,000	4,251,000
New Mexico	12,539,000	5,745,000	+402,000	6,147,000
New York	22,777,000	10,605,000	−4,578,000	6,027,000
North Carolina	13,414,000	9,413,000	−2,549,000	6,864,000
North Dakota	3,203,000	1,419,000	+1,245,000	2,664,000
Ohio	14,023,000	5,990,000	−4,808,000	1,182,000
Oklahoma	15,666,000	6,886,000	−3,191,000	3,695,000
Oregon	3,407,000	1,453,000	−662,000	791,000
Pennsylvania	11,324,000	5,365,000	−4,509,000	856,000
Rhode Island	4,533,000	2,030,000	−445,000	1,585,000
South Carolina	10,801,000	5,432,000	−1,843,000	3,589,000
South Dakota	4,741,000	2,039,000	+658,000	2,697,000
Tennessee	8,549,000	3,725,000	−3,020,000	705,000
Texas	38,467,000	16,878,000	−9,169,000	7,709,000
Utah	8,953,000	3,915,000	−2,860,000	1,055,000
Vermont	153,000	67,000	−63,000	4,000
Virginia	43,624,000	21,328,000	−13,886,000	7,442,000
Washington	16,755,000	7,339,000	−2,487,000	4,852,000
West Virginia	544,000	234,000	−216,000	18,000
Wisconsin	2,952,000	1,278,000	−707,000	571,000
Wyoming	2,120,000	908,000	+367,000	1,275,000
District of Columbia	7,484,000	3,396,000	−3,022,000	374,000
Guam	2,255,000	983,000	+264,000	1,247,000
Puerto Rico	6,131,000	6,731,000	−664,000	6,067,000
Virgin Islands	67,000	24,000	−24,000	0
Wake Island	396,000	347,000	+49,000	396,000

[1] Based on Public Law 81-874 as it exists as of May 9, 1969.

[2] Estimate based on existing data (1967) and assuming proposed amendments to the Public Law 874 formula.

[3] Estimate based on latest data (1968) and assumes existing formula but only funding children who live on Federal property with parents who are employed on Federal property and children for whom the Commissioner of Education is required to make arrangements for their education.

ALLOCATIONS TO STATES FOR OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874

CHART B

	1969 appropriation	1970 revised estimate [1]	House allowance
Total	$505,900,000	$187,000,000	$585,000,000
Alabama	9,530,000	2,362,000	11,075,000
Alaska	13,379,000	13,935,000	15,917,000
Arizona	9,059,000	6,526,000	10,825,000
Arkansas	2,696,000	958,000	3,071,000
California	78,042,000	25,225,000	88,431,000
Colorado	13,291,000	3,109,000	15,522,000
Connecticut	3,429,000	1,503,000	3,974,000
Delaware	1,922,000	1,388,000	2,212,000
Florida	17,351,000	5,013,000	20,056,000
Georgia	16,421,000	5,749,000	18,978,000
Hawaii	9,117,000	5,741,000	10,735,000
Idaho	2,656,000	1,044,000	3,225,000
Illinois	12,724,000	4,280,000	14,805,000
Indiana	4,391,000	982,000	4,974,000
Iowa	2,605,000	310,000	3,033,000
Kansas	8,534,000	3,302,000	9,836,000
Kentucky	$8,731,000	$5,604,000	$9,801,000
Louisiana	3,431,000	770,000	3,960,000
Maine	3,049,000	2,213,000	3,593,000
Maryland	24,846,000	3,387,000	29,362,000
Massachusetts	15,743,000	5,971,000	18,514,000
Michigan	4,574,000	2,852,000	5,211,000
Minnesota	2,923,000	846,000	3,367,000
Mississippi	2,615,000	1,115,000	3,048,000
Missouri	8,386,000	2,176,000	9,617,000
Montana	4,444,000	3,960,000	5,453,000
Nebraska	4,429,000	2,286,000	5,298,000
Nevada	3,457,000	1,426,000	4,130,000
New Hampshire	2,139,000	904,000	2,474,000
New Jersey	11,933,000	4,251,000	13,835,000
New Mexico	10,127,000	6,147,000	11,299,000
New York	17,641,000	6,027,000	20,504,000
North Carolina	11,198,000	6,864,000	12,621,000
North Dakota	2,501,000	2,664,000	2,886,000

Footnote at end of table.

ALLOCATIONS TO STATES FOR OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874 —Continued

CHART B—Continued

	1969 appropriation	1970 revised estimate [1]	House allowance
Ohio	$10,561,000	$1,182,000	$12,384,000
Oklahoma	12,140,000	3,695,000	13,952,000
Oregon	2,535,000	791,000	3,076,000
Pennsylvania	8,953,000	856,000	10,184,000
Rhode Island	3,578,000	1,585,000	4,084,000
South Carolina	8,446,000	3,589,000	9,872,000
South Dakota	3,587,000	2,697,000	4,216,000
Tennessee	6,566,000	705,000	7,703,000
Texas	29,659,000	7,709,000	34,617,000
Utah	6,901,000	1,055,000	8,067,000
Vermont	119,000	4,000	138,000
Virginia	$34,531,000	$7,442,000	$39,552,000
Washington	12,938,000	4,852,000	15,097,000
West Virginia	413,000	18,000	490,000
Wisconsin	2,252,000	571,000	2,660,000
Wyoming	1,600,000	1,275,000	1,910,000
District of Columbia	5,984,400	374,000	6,744,000
Guam	1,735,000	1,247,000	2,032,000
Puerto Rico	5,764,000	6,067,000	6,124,000
Virgin Islands	43,000	0	60,000
Wake Island	281,000	396,000	396,000

[1] Estimate based on latest data (1968) and assumes existing formula but only funding children who live on Federal property with parents who are employed on Federal property and "sec. 6" children whose education is arranged for by the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, unless this joint resolution is enacted promptly, the school districts that are being denied their funding under the Public Law 874 program will be faced with the decision of making drastic cuts either in personnel, in services, equipment, materials, or in other vital areas all with the resultant effect of a poor quality education. Congress has pledged itself to a quality education for all American children. Let us demonstrate that commitment by enacting this resolution and freeing the necessary funds under the Public Law 874 program immediately. We may well have to provide this same type of emergency relief for other education programs in the future if Congress does not soon enact the HEW appropriation bill. However, for the meantime, let us begin by seeking early release of funds for the Public Law 874 program based on the full amount which the school districts are entitled to for both "a" and "b" category children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my joint resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 148) to amend the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for payment to local educational agencies of full entitlements pursuant to the provisions of title I of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 148

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101(b) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution making appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes", approved June 30, 1969 (83 Stat. 38), is amended by inserting after "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended" a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That such amounts as may be necessary shall be available to pay local educational agencies full entitlements for the fiscal year 1970 pursuant to the provisions of title I of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress".

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 144

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of Senate Joint Resolution 144, to provide for the appropriation of funds to assist school districts adjoining or in the proximity of Indian reservations, to construct elementary and secondary schools and to provide proper housing and educational opportunities for Indian children attending these public schools, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 36—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SUPPORT OF CONGRESS OF A NATIONALLY PROCLAIMED WEEK HONORING MAN'S BEST FRIEND, THE DOG

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, September 21–27 will mark the 42d annual celebration of National Dog Week.

It is my understanding that the primary purpose of this celebration will be to encourage dog ownership and to achieve better standards of dog care through education for dog owners. The week has as its slogan "Deserve To Be Your Dog's Best Friend."

The people of my State have a very great feeling of appreciation for dogs. For without the faithful, and in many cases extraordinary, efforts of our huskies and malemutes much of the Northland's tundra would be impossible to travel during the winter months. It is no exaggeration that many native Alaskans depend on their dog teams for their very existence. For without their dog teams it would be impossible for these people to hunt and fish.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the concurrent resolution which I have submitted be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that man's best friend and ally, the dog, be so honored by proclaiming a National Dog Week, September 21–27, 1969. It is fitting and proper that Congress urge citizens to pay respect to this animal that contributes so much to our civilization and way of life. It is especially fitting because—

(1) The dog was the first animal to be domesticated by man, and since the earliest days of his domestication has aided his master down through the centuries in procuring food, and

(2) The dog stands always foremost of the protectors of man's life and property, and

(3) Transportation in the regions of perpetual ice and snow is in some places entirely dependent upon this hardy animal, just as he was the first beast of burden of man, and

(4) Man's best friend is a staunch and able ally of those sworn to uphold the law, as well as those who defend their country, and

(5) The dog is the only animal trained to guide the blind, or capable of such training, and

(6) Mankind's life is made happier and safer because of the companionship and devotion of this four-footed friend who stands by his master through the most bleak of times, and

(7) The week of September 21 through 27 should be designated as National Dog Week.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 providing for the Secretary of Transportation to make an investigation of potential rail transportation over existing lines and rights-of-way for passenger and mail transportation in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

SENATE RESOLUTION 245

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New

Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of Senate Resolution 245, calling for the release of American prisoners of war, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senators from Kentucky (Mr. COOK and Mr. COOPER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON TERRITORIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I wish to announce, for the information of Members of the Senate and other interested persons, that the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold an open public hearing on Wednesday, October 1, on four bills concerning our offshore territories: S. 232, to promote the economic development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; S. 1148, to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; S. 1149, to amend the Organic Act of Guam; and S. 2314, to amend section 4 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands relating to voting age.

The hearing will be held in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m. Anyone who may wish to testify on these proposals should contact the staff of the committee at the earliest possible time in order that a list of witnesses may be prepared.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF 19 GENERAL CLINICAL RESEARCH CENTERS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on August 7, 1969, on the floor of the Senate, I called attention to President Nixon's warning that the Nation faces a "major crisis in health care unless something is done about it immediately." In view of the President's statement and its support by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert Finch and Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, I find myself increasingly concerned about administration proposals for the curtailment of programs which are playing an important role in the crucial stage of medical research. I refer to a news item in the New York Times of September 9, 1969, regarding the proposal to close down 19 of the general clinical research centers throughout the country next year because of lack of funds. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, the history of the general clinical research centers program of the National Institutes of Health may not be familiar to millions who may benefit in the future from its activity. Physicians and surgeons working in hospitals during the 19th century advanced medical science as far as they could through empirical observation. This was followed during the first half of the 20th century by a remarkable increase in the scientific base of medicine. This led to the realization that something new and different was required if clinical science were to keep pace with the rapid changes occurring in the biological sciences.

In 1959, in response to this emerging requirement, the U.S. Senate recommended that centralized facilities be created in universities to provide highly integrated research opportunities and services to large numbers of investigators and research groups. The National Advisory Health Council interpreted this directive to mean creation of clinical research centers to support research of the highest quality, centered around patients and backed by laboratories and other ancillary facilities. The goal of the GCRC program is to provide centers where physicians and scientists can define and attempt to conquer the great unsolved problems of human disease. Each center provides a highly coordinated environment that allows the controlled conditions necessary for precise clinical investigations. They are essential to much of the clinical research supported by project grants, since the studies require the special facilities available in the centers.

There are now 93 general clinical research centers located in 32 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. During the past year, 2,762 investigators used these resources, and 2,525 physicians and 2,538 medical students received training in research techniques in these centers. The program has been hard hit by rising hospitalization costs and by the increased need for sophisticated equipment and facilities to carry out the end of the programs. For fiscal year 1970, the National Advisory Research Resources Council recommended the amount of $48.5 million to operate the 93 centers; the administration budget provided $35 million; and the House Appropriations Committee increased the amount of $39 million, the amount requested in the original 1970 budget. This would provide funds for the operation of 93 centers at an absolute minimal level.

Of the 93 general clinical research centers, 19 specialize in clinical research on children's diseases. Progress is being made at these centers on many fronts to reduce this Nation's relatively high infant mortality rate and morbidity rate. Infants with assorted physical abnormalities have been recognized and early treatment instituted. Of the 19 centers that have been warned they may have to close down next year because of lack of funds, eight are pediatric centers. This represents nearly one-half the number that have been making vast strides in improving the health care of young children.

In view of the administration's proposal for a 5-year plan that would expand federally financed health care for the young, it would appear that this program is not one that should be cut back. This is still another example of the disparity between the goals expressed by the administration and the financial support it recommends.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETEEN CLINICAL UNITS FACING SHUTDOWN—MEDICAL RESEARCH CENTERS WARNED THEY MAY LOSE U.S. FUNDS NEXT YEAR

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, September 8.—The directors of 19 medical research centers throughout the nation have received letters from the National Institutes of Health warning them that they may have to close down next year because of lack of funds.

Most of the centers are affiliated with major medical schools, where they play an important role in the crucial final stage of medical research. This is the phase in which new ideas, drugs and devices that have been tested in the laboratory are first made available to patients.

In short, it is the phase where the benefits of advanced science and technology are first used to improve patient care.

The research units are called general clinical research centers. The National Institutes of Health supports 93 of them at present. Some have been in existence since 1960. All of those that may face closing next year have been operating for several years.

The centers have been described as "hospitals in miniature." Each is equipped to care for a few hospitalized patients at a time—the range is between four and 35. The care is particularly thorough, designed to test the merits of promising new concepts in medical and surgical treatment.

Much of the modern experience in organ transplantation has been gained in such centers. They have also contributed to improvements in care of shock patients and high-blood pressure cases and in understanding of many aspects of maternal and infant health.

Indeed, parents of the children who have been treated at one such center in Chicago have protested to their representatives in Washington on learning yesterday that the unit might lose its financial support. This center has been in operation for about five years at the Children's Memorial Hospital in Chicago.

Dr. Robert B. Lawson, professor and chairman of pediatrics there, said today that he had been shocked when he received the letter saying the center might have to be phased out during the next 12 months.

He said comparable facilities for dealing with infant and maternal health problems were scarce. Furthermore, he said, the hospital cannot afford to support the center through nongovernment funds.

In answer to a query today, Dr. William R. DeCesare of the National Institutes of Health confirmed that he had sent out letters to 19 of the 93 centers on Aug. 15.

RELUCTANCE EXPRESSED

Dr. DeCesare, chief of the general clinical research centers branch of the institutes' division of research resources, said that the step had been taken with great reluctance.

The letter said that no final decisions had been made but asked the institutions to draw up contingency plans for phasing out their Government-supported activities by Oct. 1 of next year.

During the fiscal year 1969, the 93 centers have been funded on a minimal basis with a total of $35-million. Because of continued inflation in medical costs, that same amount next year would not allow even minimal operation for all of them.

As one planner explained, the choice was between substandard operation for all 93

centers and reduction in the total number so that the surviving centers could operate effectively.

The hard choice of which centers to consider dropping was made with the aid of two independent advisory groups—the National Advisory Research Resources Council and the General Clinical Research Centers Review Committee.

Four of the centers that may lose their Federal support are in New York State. They are at Albert Einstein College of Medicine in the Bronx; the Albany Medical College of Union University in Albany, and the State University of New York Medical Centers in Buffalo and Syracuse.

The others are situated in 12 other states. Seven of them specialize in clinical research on diseases of children.

The full list of 19 was supplied today by Dr. John A. D. Cooper, president of the Association of American Medical Colleges. All of the institutions at which the centers are situated are members of the association. Dr. Cooper said that his organization was deeply concerned over the probable cutback in clinical research centers.

"It will be a substantial setback in clinical research which aims at getting the real answers to disease," he said during an interview today.

OTHER CENTERS LISTED

He said that the centers were usually major research and training resources for their parent institutions and sometimes for their entire regions. They have had an important impact on medical education, he said, and on the effort to increase the ranks of medical manpower and effectiveness in delivery of health services to patients.

In addition to the four in New York, the centers that have received letters warning of a possible cutback are at:

University of California at Los Angeles; Children's Hospital of Los Angeles; Medical College of Georgia; Children's Memorial Hospital, Chicago; University of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago.

Also, Indiana University School of Medicine; University of Kentucky Medical Center; University of Maryland School of Medicine; Wayne State University Children's Hospital of Michigan; University of Mississippi School of Medicine.

Also, Children's Hospital Research Foundation of Columbus, Ohio; University of Cleveland; Children's Memorial Hospital of the University of Oklahoma Medical Center; Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia and Baylor University College of Medicine in Houston.

MAXIMUM USE OF OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the tremendous interest in the natural resources of the Far North, generated in part by the great petroleum discoveries on the north slope of my State, is evidenced by the renewed efforts to develop the mineral wealth of the Yukon Territory.

While we sit on the greatest storehouse of mineral wealth in the world and, at the same time, are plagued by dwindling supplies of critical raw materials, the Yukon Territory, through incentives and cooperation with private developers, is dramatically increasing Canadian mineral production. In light of the passage by this body of S. 719, which establishes a policy favoring development of our mineral resources, the efforts of the Yukon to stimulate development of its mineral wealth may well offer a useful example of how we can eliminate this paradox and carry out our national policy.

Don Sawatsky, Whitehorse correspondent for Alaska Industry magazine, describes this new development in a recent article. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YUKON MINING: WHAT MAKES IT SO SUCCESSFUL?

(By Don Sawatsky)

The Yukon territory—comprising 207,000 square miles and only about 18,000 people—is finally beginning to come full circle.

After more than 60 years of almost total political, social and economic limbo (except for a few short years during the building of the Alaska Highway), Canada's most northerly and westerly territory is beginning to feel the first effects of millions in development money. It's the mines and exploration companies that are pumping this economic lifeblood into an otherwise starved economy and unlike the famed and fabled Klondike gold rush of 1898, this rush looks as though it's here to stay.

The advent of a couple of new mines may seem to be a rather narrow base on which to rest an entire economic analysis but it must be kept in mind, that an estimated 65 prospecting syndicates, exploration companies and operating mining companies were active in Yukon during 1968. Their spending on Yukon projects amounted to about $7 million.

This, considering that Yukon was almost completely dormant prior to 1965, is a jolting amount of money to be plunged suddenly into an area with such a small population, and, except for tourism, little economic base.

And, there's virtually no one in the territory, both from government and private enterprise, who will deny that it's just the beginning. D. W. Carr, president of D. William Carr and Associates, conducted an economic survey of the territory in 1968 on behalf of the federal government. The findings were optimistic beyond the wildest beliefs of many Yukoners:

"For the first time the territory may look forward with reasonable assurance to a sustained and rising tempo of investment, employment, growth and development in all phases of life—economic, social and cultural. It is no longer a question of if, but when.

"The activity to date has been the result of a number of influences. A growing world demand and price for the ores found in the Yukon, the longer-run view of sources and the increased willingness to expand exploratory horizons as ores are dug out of more and more remote regions of the globe are the wider influences at work," the report stated.

But, more concretely, the advance of technology is reducing the real costs of cold, darkness and exposure on both men and machines. Transportation and communication are being improved and cheapened in real terms so that time and distance from head office to the field are not so significant.

Additionally, the Yukon has enjoyed the "legacy of the defense period" which has provided a more reasonable base from which to move. Government development incentives have bridged the critical gap between discovery of a potential ore body and proving it up for production.

Most mining men feel that the government incentives, such as Tote Trail Assistance, prospector assistance and a cost-sharing program for resource development airports in the North, have been one of the keys to unlock the hitherto resource riches of the North.

Until the mid-1960s, federal government policy generally has been based on a short-term, ad hoc approach that dealt with emergencies after they were passed and formed policies largely with little idea of the unique local circumstances. Policy was directed basically toward exploitation of a few high-grade ore bodies that were discovered from time to time. Now, this narrow, myopic approach seems to be changing.

It all started with the discovery of the giant lead-zinc ore body near Ross River, 230 miles northeast of Whitehorse. The apparent size of the discovery by Yukon prospector Al Kulan sparked a frenzy of staking throughout 1965 and 1966. The announcement in August of 1967 that the Anvil Mining Corporation Ltd. would bring the orebody into production in 1969 maintained the excitement.

Prospectors from across Canada flooded the country, examining old mines and discovering new, promising properties. As a direct result of the Vangorda discovery at Ross River, new finds of silver-lead have been reported in the Mayo area, Ketza River and McMillan River country and new copper discoveries have been reported in the Quill Creek, Bonnett Plume, White River and Whitehorse areas.

At the moment, the lead-zinc reserves that have been proven by Anvil and Kerr Addison in the Vangorda area are estimated at well over 80 million tons. By 1970, with the coming into production of Anvil, the value of mineral production in the Yukon will reach more than $50 million.

There are six producing mines or mines that will be in production this year as well as about 30 small placer operations in the Dawson City and Mayo areas:

New Imperial Mines Ltd. (copper) situated about five miles south of Whitehorse, came into production in June of 1967. The mill has a capacity of 2,500 tons a day and employs about 170 men in an open pit operation. Cost of the complex was $7 million. Relatively little exploration work has been carried out so far. However, during the past few months some work has been done with the view to going underground. The company has an estimated 8.7 million total known tons of reserves, 3.7 million tons of 1¼ to two per cent copper underground. Underground work will begin next year. Concentrates are shipped by White Pass to Skagway for Japanese markets.

United Keno Hill Mines Ltd. (silver-lead). Once the largest silver-lead mine in North America, operations were cut back from 525 tons a day to about 200 tons in August of 1967 because of failing ore reserves and mounting production costs. Recently, the company has been prospecting, carrying out geochemical surveys, over-burden drilling, diamond drilling, trenching and underground exploration in the Galena Hill, Keno Hill and Mount Hinton areas of Mayo and the results have encouraged rehabilitation of the Sadie-Ladue Mine on Keno Hill. A new vein near the Elsa camp has been uncovered.

Cassiar Asbestos Corp. (asbestos) at Clinton Creek, 40 miles northwest of Dawson, brought its property into production in October, 1967, at a rated capacity of 60,000 tons of asbestos fibre a year. The mill is designed to increase to 80,000 tons at a later date. It employs about 200 men and the estimated cost of building the plant was $24 million. (In addition, the federal government spent $4.5 million on roads and bridges in the general area. The fibre is trucked to Whitehorse where White Pass rails it to Vancouver.)

Arctic Mining and Exploration (gold-silver) announced production plans for its property on Montana Mountain near Carcross, 45 miles south of Whitehorse, and construction of the 200 ton-a-day mine and mill was completed in 1968. Drilling indicated a strong vein of good grade silver ore 180 feet by four feet and other veins have also indicated promising grades.

Venus Mines Ltd. (gold-silver) is across from Arctic Mining on Windy Arm and plans to come into production later this year or

early next. It has at least 50,000 tons of gold-silver, valued at $29.61 per ton.

Anvil Mining Corporation (lead-zinc) announced in 1967 that their ore body would come into production in early fall of 1969 but a forest fire that destroyed the half-built townsite of Faro will likely put the original schedule behind. Anvil will produce 370,000 tons of lead-zinc concentrates a year. A road has been completed between Ross River and Carmacks at a cost of $9 million and concentrates are to be hauled to Whitehorse by truck and then railed to Skagway for Japanese markets. Seven million dollars is being spent by White Pass on improving the existing rail system and building new dock facilities at Skagway.

Activity is bubbling in practically every corner of the territory. There are promising properties around Mayo, Watson Lake, the 60-Mile country west of Dawson and Hart River, all of which may come to the fore within the next couple of years.

Northern Development Minister John Chretien feels that the future is promising but in a recent speech to the third annual Northern Development Conference in Whitehorse issued this warning:

"Development does not occur in a vacuum—it is closely related to political, social and economic development and priorities in other parts of Canada and the world, many of which cannot be controlled by the government. Thus the rate of future growth in the Yukon depends upon more than the rate of future government investment in the territory."

Dr. Carr touched on this point, too, in his report: ". . . economic history has demonstrated that economic development is much less a function of resources and technology than it is of institutions and attitudes. Resource potential may be a necessary condition for development but it is by no means a sufficient condition to ensure it.

"Public policy must do much more to identify the resource potential and much more to provide sufficient conditions for its exploitation. Its role is not one of selective paternalism toward particular enterprises nor is it a partnership with them.

"It is a serious recognition that the benefits from development are not regional but national and that the public sector is the agent responsible for the location and nature of development. Its priorities ought to be based more closely on the widespread multiplier effects on employment and income than on the short term project pay-out."

Dr. Carr said Yukon and most of the northwest regions of Canada have reached a critical plateau in their economic progress, where the potential for economic growth seems to warrant a new departure from the philosophy of development that has dominated the region over so much of the past 60 years. It is a departure not unlike that which brought the great plains of Canada into the national economy.

Gordon McIntyre, Yukon mining inspector, is convinced that government incentives provide a major impetus to the wide exploration activity, particularly for the small prospector and young company.

"It's far easier to launch a mining company in Canada than in the U.S.," he said. "It's easier to float a stock issue to finance an operation through the Vancouver Stock Exchange than through any of the American exchanges because U.S. securities administration is much tighter than in Canada."

Most of the companies who have come to Yukon since the boom started in 1965 are Vancouver-based people. He added that mining activity in Alaska is at a near standstill because of the higher labor costs.

"They've priced themselves right out of competition by their higher cost of production."

Most of the men who work in mining in the territory are immigrant labor from other parts of Canada or from Europe, mostly Germans, Italians and Hungarians. But, mining operations are having a rather peculiar problem with finding miners to man their equipment: Canada is just too prosperous. Men don't feel they have to go into the mines to make a buck! This was part of the reason for United Keno Hill cutting back on its production.

Those who do go into the mines make a fairly decent living. Virtually all are organized. Following is a list of estimated wages that are pretty well basic throughout the territory:

Laborers for underground operations get from $2.75 to $2.80; surface laborers $2.90 to $3; miners $3.20 to $3.50; drillers $3.50; blasters $3.50 to $3.60; trades people about $4; heavy duty operators $3.60; shovel operators $4 to $4.25.

Miners also receive a bonus for tonnage or danger which can amount to from $10 to $50 a day depending on the individual and most employes get a guaranteed $3 a day bonus.

They work a 44-hour week with time and half after eight hours and double time after 12. They also get nine statutory holidays, $75 a week in sickness benefits for up to 36 weeks, $10,000 in life insurance while they are employed with the company, paid transportation to either Vancouver or Edmonton for a man and his wife at least once a year and sometimes twice, two weeks holiday after one year, three weeks after five years and four weeks after 10 years along with special leave provisions.

Problems facing Yukon companies are similar to those experienced in Alaska; severe winter conditions, distance from consuming markets and from source of supply of both materials and adequate experienced labor, inadequately developed transportation routes and lack of cheap power. These all add to the cost of operation.

Transportation is the key. Roads are being pushed into more remote areas every month. There has been talk of a railroad, either an extension of White Pass or the nationally-owned Canadian National Railway which is now conducting a survey of the area up to Whitehorse and into Ross River country.

One of the world's largest iron ore deposits is in the Snake River country northeast of Dawson City, for example, and this potential production depends on the three main factors—financing, transportation and markets.

It's the giant Crest Exploration development that offers tens of billions of tons of ore with several billions of tons available for open pitting. The iron content of the hematite jasper ore varies between 45 and 50 per cent and varies in gross thickness from 90 feet to a maximum of 340 feet in its exposed length of 30 miles.

This fabulous find was first recognized by the California Standard geological field party during the late fall of 1961 and staking started along the boundary of Yukon and Northwest Territories in the spring of 1962, although the general location was common knowledge since gold rush days.

But, throughout the past 60 years private prospectors still represent the main-stay of exploration in the territory. It's anybody's guess, but there are probably more than 50 full-time independent prospectors in the territory and 150 more representing companies and syndicates.

Wally Hyde of Whitehorse feels that since the Dynasty discovery the odds to come up with a paying proposition has risen from 15 per cent and 25 per cent to 50 per cent or more. Three or four years ago it was generally accepted that only about five per cent of the entire Yukon had been thoroughly prospected. Now, this has risen to about 10 to 15 per cent.

Hyde decries the "Al Capone attitude" of some companies who pick up moose pasture and promote strictly on the basis of speculation. "Although there are a very few of these types of characters, they are the type that mine the people and not the properties. It makes a bad name for the industry as a whole and there's no defense against them—just common sense."

Generally, he claims, the people who are working in the Yukon are honest.

The Yukon Chamber of Mines is one of the strongest organizations in the territory and it has been one of the leading advocates of change for the Yukon Quartz Mining Act, an Act that most mining men accept as antediluvian. Proposed amendments to the Act have been held up in the federal cabinet for the past year or two but time is running out.

"We simply have to have these changes in the Act now," Chamber president Bert Boyd has said. "The present legislation is worse than none at all."

Boyd said many of the sections are so vague you have no guide lines, some are so discriminatory they simply aren't fair to anyone—some are too lenient and some are too strict. "The whole thing has to be opened up."

Many mining men in the territory feel that while the current boom is a result of the Anvil development, another large find is going to have to be announced soon or the present high enthusiasm is quickly going to be dispelled.

Mining is a non-renewable resource and to attain highest amount of recovery there must be a mutual agreement between private enterprise and government to approach the problems jointly and intelligently.

It's generally felt that the entire proposition is a partnership between the territory and the Ottawa and the United States and other foreign markets. Without the cooperation, the terriory's minerals are useless.

As Northern Development Minister Chretien says: "If the promise of development is to be fulfilled, there will have to be continued incentive programs, road development, transportation development, power development and social capital in large amounts. The federal government is committed to Northern development, not for purely economic reasons, although we hope they will be economic, but for social reasons, for national reasons. We cannot leave the North undeveloped."

BIG DOLLAR IMPACT BY IRRIGATION IN NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, agriculture is Nebraska's greatest industry. In 1968, the Nebraska cash receipts for livestock and livestock products were $1.27 billion and, for crops, cash receipts were $484 million. Most Nebraskans, whether selling shoes or insurance, are greatly affected by the well-being of the agricultural community.

The Cornhusker State rates fifth in corn production and sheep feeding, first in the production of alfalfa meal, wild hay, and great northern beans, second in grain-fed cattle marketed and in commercial livestock slaughtered, third in sorghum production, grain storage capacity, and number of cattle, and fourth in wheat production.

In making Nebraska the thriving State that it is today, irrigation has had a tremendous role. Its 3.3 million acres under irrigation make it the third highest State in irrigated land. Most of the irrigation is provided by pumps. In 1967, only about 420,000 of those 3.3 million acres were supplied with water by facilities constructed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Major benefits in terms of dollars have resulted from the growth of irrigated agriculture.

The August 1969 issue of Reclamation Era, a Water Review Quarterly, published by the U.S. Department of Interior, contains an article entitled "Big Dollar Impact in Nebraska." This article discusses the great advantages that irrigation has brought to Nebraska agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG DOLLAR IMPACT IN NEBRASKA: $812.3 MILLION PER YEAR FROM IRRIGATION

(By Richard F. Barber, Jr., regional economist, Grand Island)

Between rocky bluffs and such landmark mounts on western prairies were spread miles of plains over which travelers made their way years ago. When they used that section of the Oregon Trail which traversed Nebraska prairies, Scottsbluff always was one of their reliable landmarks.

Many of these travelers stopped at likely prairie locations along the way, took plows from their wagons and tried them. Generally the soil they prepared was fertile. But most of the thirsty crops did not get a wetting before withering and dying.

In making Nebraska the thriving State it is today, a big change was made. Major benefits in terms of dollars, and other obvious ways, have resulted from the growth of irrigated agriculture. It is the primary reason that agriculture is the State's dominant industry. The once parched prairie around the majestic Scottsbluff—as only one of the soil-rich areas—now includes irrigated fields of lush alfalfa from which a farm operator profits with multiple harvests annually.

So many men have taken the opportunity for irrigation farming in Nebraska, that more than 3 million acres are now under irrigation—the third highest State in such acreage. A greater percentage of the cropland is without irrigation. But it is revealed in an economic impact study that the value of crops which farmers were able to produce by irrigation exceeded equivalent dryland farm values by $121.6 million in only 1 year.

SUPPLIERS $157 MILLION

That year, 1963, is when the Census of Manufacturers was available for analysis. The recently completed penetrating study of that census and other data showed that businesses providing farm products and services, direct and indirect—being induced by the large irrigation production in the State—received sales increase of $157 million. This is 29 percent greater than the farm production increase.

Businesses which received the $157 million supplied such wide ranging items as machinery, fertilizer, seed, and other commodities farmers need for growing crops.

Meanwhile, the sales increase to the business sector which handles and processes the irrigation production, was $534 million for the year. This is a comparison of $4.39 to $1, referring to use of the products in the greater segment of the economic community such as households; and by such manufacturers as mining, metals, and machinery; and such businesses as livestock, finance, insurance, real estate, and transportation.

In other words, the high value of irrigation for 1963 increased the total business volume by $812.3 million, or about $300 per irrigated acre, figured in view of the slightly more than 3 million irrigated acres in the State.

Although there are 40 million acres of land under irrigation in the United States, few people understand or appreciate the chain reaction of benefits which results from the productivity of these lands. For this reason the Bureau of Reclamation has sponsored economic impact studies of this and other irrigation areas.

A study completed in 1966, in cooperation with Washington State University, focused on the economic significance of the Columbia Basin water development project in the State of Washington.

This economic analysis, was completed by the University of Nebraska's Bureau of Business Research under contract with Reclamation. The Nebraska study team was headed by Dr. Theodore W. Roesler, professor of economics. He was aided by Dr. F. Charles Lamphear, associate professor of economics, and David Beveridge, a student Ph. D. candidate.

Roesler and Lamphear were able to work full time on the project from July 1967, to September 1968.

RESEARCH METHODS

Census statistics were augmented by questionnaires and personal interviews which enabled the researchers to sample from 22 to 89 percent of industries within specific categories operating in the State.

The Cornhusker State of 1.5 million persons rates fifth in corn production and sheep feeding. However, it is first in the production of alfalfa meal, wild hay, and Great Northern beans. It is second in grain-fed cattle marketed, and in commercial livestock slaughtered.

It is third in sorghum production, grain storage capacity, and number of cattle. It is fourth in wheat production.

Of the 3.3 million acres irrigated in Nebraska in 1967, about 420,000 were supplied with water from facilities constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Growth of irrigation in the postwar period has been rapid and shows a significant future potential. Between 1947 and 1963, the value of total crop production produced on irrigated land increased from 10 percent to 27 percent.

A significant $3.5 billion of increased business activity was generated during the 20-year period from 1946–65 directly by the farmers and by businesses where farmers make purchases for their agricultural production.

Industry stemming from processing farm goods was not studied in detail for the 20-year period, but was estimated in the study to be at least another $6.5 billion, producing an overall economic impact of more than $10 billion over the 20 years.

While the effects of this increased activity due to irrigation extended well beyond the State, no attempt was made to measure its economic impact. However, it is significant that in 1963 an estimated 60 percent of Nebraska's irrigated crop production was sold outside the State.

For a State of "parched prairies"—but of productive action which only irrigation developments could have caused—Nebraska is making a valuable impact on the Nation.

TINDERBOX IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, our distinguished former Ambassador to the Organization of American States, the Honorable Sol Linowitz, has written a sensitive, disturbing, and highly perceptive article for the Saturday Review on the state of our relations with Latin America. I commend the article to all Senators who are interested in the state of our relations with this crucial area of the world whose population is now more than that of the United States.

I invite the particular attention of Congress to two sections of the article.

Ambassador Linowitz writes:

Obviously, it is far from the intent of the Congress to do anything that would slow the rhythm of development in Latin America, for that could only weaken the constructive forces of peaceful change and give impetus to those who believe in violence as the way to alter the status quo. But cutting our share of the alliance appropriation has this precise effect, whether that is the intent or not, and the United States cannot evade responsibility.

Later in the article, Ambassador Linowitz observes that the Alliance for Progress "is not a bilateral aid program, but rather a cooperative self-help program, to be carried out primarily by the people of Latin America. The United States is one partner in the program, of which 90 percent is financed by the countries of Latin America."

Ambassador Linowitz then goes on to describe our Alliance appropriation "as a hand of help extended in friendship."

In acting on this year's aid request, I would urge Congress to continue the financing of this hand of help extended in friendship—it is important to Latin America and to the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TINDERBOX IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Sol M. Linowitz)

(NOTE.—Sol M. Linowitz, former United States Ambassador to the Organization of American States, is presently practicing law in New York and Washington, D.C.)

For some time now it has become a tired Washington cliché to issue periodic pronouncements to the effect that United States relations with Latin America are in a state of crisis and we must, finally, do something about it. It would be difficult to find anyone, no matter how sparse his knowledge of the hemisphere, who would argue about the crisis half of the cliché. It is the latter part—"do something about it"—that causes all the trouble.

James Reston once observed that the American people will do anything for Latin America except read about it. The apathy is so widespread and endemic, however, that the usually reliable Mr. Reston may have overstated the case with regard to the American people's willingness to do anything for their hemispheric neighbors.

There is a paradox about the situation that contributes to making it one of the most perplexing among the many foreign policy problems that periodically plague Washington administrations, no matter what their political gender. Beginning with Franklin Roosevelt and his Good Neighbor Policy through John Kennedy and the Alliance for Progress, Lyndon Johnson and the summit meeting of American presidents, and now Richard Nixon and the Rockefeller Latin American study mission, no President, Democratic or Republican, in nearly two generations has denied the importance of Latin America, or has claimed it can be negelcted or ignored.

Yet despite all the programs and official avowals of concern, who can find any sense of excitement about Latin America among the people of the United States? That does not mean we do not get worked up over a Castro, a Cuban missile crisis, a Dominican Republic crisis, an oil company expropriation, a fishing boat seizure. Or that we are not shocked when the visit of a Governor Rockefeller, who is rightly regarded as a friend of Latin America, touches off nasty demonstrations.

That is the heart of the paradox, for the emotions are genuine and the concern is real. Yet when the crisis of the moment is over, emotion subsides and concern is shrugged off, and once again we turn our attention to another part of the world—until some new Latin explosion, such as the El Salvador-Honduran clash, reluctantly drags it back again to our own hemisphere.

To suggest that this lack of public interest is directly responsible for the state of affairs in Latin America would be less than accurate. Surely it is not responsible for the nagging economic underdevelopment that grips the continent and its 240 million people—240 million who will be 600 million before the century is out, and, if circumstances continue as they are, many times poorer.

The other side of the coin, however, is that our public disinterest sharply points up the inescapable fact that there is no real Latin American constituency in the United States—a political nuance that the Congress has not failed to notice.

Last year, for example, we disappointed the people of Latin America with cuts in our appropriation for the Alliance for Progress—cuts that made it the lowest since that vital program was launched in 1961: $336-million against some $500-million in 1966 and $460-million the following year. This year President Nixon has proposed an appropriation of $603-million, and already we are beginning to hear the sound of chopping on Capitol Hill.

Obviously, it is far from the intent of Congress to do anything that would slow the rhythm of development in Latin America, for that could only weaken the constructive forces of peaceful change and give impetus to those who believe in violence as the way to alter the status quo. But cutting our share of the alliance appropriation has this precise effect, whether that is the intent or not, and the United States cannot evade responsibility.

What it all boils down to is that we cannot help Latin America solve its economic problems with bargain-basement tactics. We cannot do it on the cheap. Rhetoric is fine in its place, and the ringing words of our regard for Latin America make for fine speeches. But without the financial commitment to back up the words we are in trouble in this hemisphere, and we had better make no mistake about it.

Too often in our relations with Latin America over the years we in the United States have not done as we said, nor have we always said clearly just what it is we would do. Our promises, moreover, have not always withstood the test of time or pressure. The people of Latin America have good reason to be confused about how seriously we regard them and their problems and, based on past experience, even better reason to have skepticism with regard to the credibility and continuity of the commitments we make to them.

There should be no doubt that this uncertainty in Latin America is a contributory factor in the repeated demonstrations of anti-U.S. sentiments that crop up with disturbing frequency, or that it is a potent weapon in the hands of those who relish the notion of a fragmented Western Hemisphere, with the South being played off against the North. Nor can there be any question that the time is long past for Washington to undertake a credible commitment to the republics of Latin America that will resolve the doubts that now give rise to such uncertainty and even to fear.

President Johnson, following the summit meeting of American presidents at Punta del Este in 1967, went a long way toward extending such a commitment when he said, "We will persevere. There is no time limit on our commitment." But realistically speaking, the words he spoke did not have the force of law or of a treaty—a fact Congress made all the more evident when it cut the alliance funds last year. And with a change of Administration, accompanied by all the uncertainty that such a change brings with it, the Latins are still wondering how far we will go, and to what extent we will persevere.

It was not, I am sure, President Nixon's intent to add to this uncertainty when, a few months after taking office, he addressed the Organization of American States and strongly criticized the alliance for all that it had left undone. Even the dispatch of Governor Rockefeller on his fact-finding mission, rather than help assuage fears that Washington was contemplating a major change in its Latin American policy, only intensified the uncomfortable feeling that, once again, things were up in the air.

Inevitably, there will be much of value in what Governor Rockefeller will be reporting to the President, but the point cannot be overstressed that we need, above all, patience, perspective, and the determination to see the job through, Latin America should not be an issue for domestic party politics. Quite the contrary, it offers what is perhaps the most inviting area for constructive and imaginative bipartisan foreign policy cooperation.

It is the kind of cooperation that must look beyond the immediate horizon and focus on another far off, one still shrouded in clouds of uncertainty. For no matter what we do, no matter how firm our commitment, no matter what funds we appropriate to help the people of Latin America to build and to develop their continent, no matter what our trade policies, we cannot guarantee the future; we cannot say that if we do this Latin America will be an unwavering ally and firm friend of the United States, that it will offer us a vast commercial market for our goods. No one—politician, economist, or seer—can offer any such guarantee. And even if he could, it would be a poor motivation for the kind of effort that must be undertaken for the remainder of this century.

Latin America is not for sale to the highest bidder, and if we gear our programs with the idea that it is, we are in for a sad awakening—an awakening that, as recent events demonstrate, has already begun. What we must understand is that change in Latin America is inevitable. The only question remaining is whether it is to be a violent change or a relatively peaceful one, and obviously, therefore, our own best interests would dictate that we aid those forces seeking to build and to strengthen economic and political democracy in Latin America.

If they should fail, the change that is bound to follow can only be one of violence. All the explosive ingredients are present. For in Latin America, even as in the United States, we cannot expect people denied hope and dignity to sit patiently while life and the world passes them by.

The point has been made that if Latin American governments do not pass badly needed economic and social reforms they deserve to fall. And it has been argued too that perhaps some violence may be necessary to convince the oligarchies and military governments that desperate conditions beget desperate actions. To some extent it is difficult to answer these arguments. It is all too true that in too many cases Latin governments are not doing all they should and all they could to cope with the underlying causes of economic and social underdevelopment, nor are they doing enough of what must be done to promote the growth of representative government responsive to the will of the people. These facts are all too glaring to be swept under the rug, and we should recognize them for what they are—part of the reality of Latin America today.

What all this points up is the truism evident wherever people are struggling to be free—economically, socially, and politically: Time is not on the side of those who would shelter the status quo. Those who would see democracy and freedom fulfill their destiny have the responsibility of seeing to it that the vicious circle of poverty, sickness, and illiteracy is broken once and for all. People within its orbit live outside the mainstream of society and really play no part in shaping their nation's policies; because they are not part of the democratic process, they have little stake in it.

Clearly we must do all we can to encourage the growth of orderly, democratic procedures sensitive to the needs of the people they are designed to serve. But we can not and must not elbow our way into another country's system, telling it how it should manage its affairs, as if we had all the answers. We haven't, as the problems before us of putting our own house in order aptly testify.

What we can do however—and what we have not done with any real consistency—is to make clear our firm commitment to representative government and to the growth of political democracy in this hemisphere. Such a policy will enable us to develop special friendships with Latin America's men of vision, with the men who know that peaceful social progress is endangered by any entrenchment of the privileged few.

Today the despair that exists in much of Latin America provides the climate in which a Batista or a Castro flourishes best, or in which a despotism of the right can provide the foundation for a dictatorship of the left. Or vice versa. It is a situation that only underscores the urgency of continuing the partnership launched eight years ago this month when President Kennedy, following a Latin-inspired initiative known as "Operation Pan-America," pledged the support of the United States to the Alliance for Progress.

The alliance was a magnificent concept, with goals and aspirations to match its grandeur. If it can be faulted in hindsight, it would be for assuming that the job could be done in ten years. That, and setting an annual growth-rate goal without recognizing that the birth rate was shooting up at a pace that far exceeded Latin America's growth-rate capabilities.

But who can argue that any program of the scope and reach of the alliance—a program designed to bring about the upheaval of the Latin American continent and build a healthy, vibrant, economically secure, and politically sound inter-American community—must not set its sights high, and that it must not keep them there? Surely not the people who live without amenities of civilization, or without hope of a better tomorrow. For they can attain that tomorrow only if there is no compromise in the fight to attain the goals the alliance so eloquently set forth—goals for better housing, education, health, tax and land reforms, a revitalized and modernized industry and agriculture, and an integrated continent-wide economy.

Yet the yearly per capita growth rate still is well behind the Punta del Este goal of 2.5 per cent. The birth rate soars. Fifty per cent of the people are illiterate. The cities are clogged with workless *campesinos*. Tight protective tariffs protect inefficient monopolies. Feudalism persists in the countryside, and the people there go hungry or move away.

If it was a mistake then to hope that this could be changed in ten years, it would be catastrophic now to turn our backs on what has been done. True, economic sufficiency remains a distant goal, but for the first time a way has been charted out of the Latin American jungle of underdevelopment.

The statistics add up to an impressive total, particularly in an area of the world that has never experienced such concentrated doses of progress. But no statistic can possibly convey the meaning of a new road that slices through an Amazon jungle and links up a hitherto isolated village with the heartland of its country. Nor can it convey the significance of a new classroom opened for children in the plateaus of the Andes or

in the *barios* of the cities; of a *campesino* who now works his own farm; of water supplies made potable; of infant mortality rates reduced; of a family able to quit the sordid life of the slums for a new start in a new apartment.

And with all the statistics totaled up, it is clear that the alliance has devoted more of its resources to investments in the social areas, particularly education and health services, than in any other sector.

The actual rate of Latin American development, therefore, is higher than the economic growth charts indicate simply because social investment is not reflected in Latin America's gross product. But the direct effort to speed up the processes of education and social welfare is the surest guarantee that an obsolete social order will be peacefully transformed, as in Japan or Britain, rather than explosively altered via the violent, revolutionary routes of eighteenth-century France or twentieth-century Russia.

What must be understood above all about the alliance—and perhaps the most misunderstood feature, even among a number of our own key government officials—is that it is not a bilateral American aid program, but rather a cooperative self-help program, to be carried out primarily by the people of Latin America. The United States is one partner in this program, of which 90 percent is financed by the countries of Latin America. The alliance is not ours to manipulate, and the amount we appropriate, therefore, is no handout, but a hand of help extended in friendship. Congress must not forget this when considering how much we can afford to appropriate for our share of the effort.

When all is said and done, and with all that remains undone, there is no escape from the conclusion that eight years ago the alliance launched a truly creative, regenerative development program. But it was, and is, only the first step in a long journey. In our inter-American relations, we need most of all a sense of propriety, a sense of time, a sense of scale, and a sense of destiny.

As for propriety, Americans may find wry amusement in cartoons that depict the stereotyped Latin American—the sleepy, guitar-playing, sombrero-wearing, not too ambitious but pleasant fellow. But the stereotyped North American—the Yankee with the dollar sign for a heart—is hardly the object for smiles in Latin America. The truth, of course, is that neither stereotype is valid today, if it ever was.

The people of Latin America are a combination of some of the wealthiest cultures our civilization has known. Its young people, with their passion for country and their zeal for the future, are restless and prone to impatience. They are skeptical of our aims and so are more willing to blame us for their problems than to understand the difficulties in solving them. Yet these are the people with the mystique and the vision of grandeur who can spark the enthusiasm and loyalties of their countrymen. These are the people who are so anxiously searching for a revolution of social justice—the very people we must convince that we want to work with them because our continued partnership is essential to the future of freedom. In so doing, anti-Communism as such will not get us very far. It is not a powerful argument for the average citizen who is steeped in a personal struggle to keep his head above water.

A student at the University of Chile once summed it up when he told me: "The United States is constantly talking about the value of political democracy. We agree that it is essential, but we also feel you would accomplish far more if you said less about political democracy and put more of your weight behind the concept of economic democracy."

What he was saying is that city slum dwellers denied hope and illiterate rural Indians denied even a glimpse of the twentieth century neither comprehend the meaning of political democracy nor offer any foundation to sustain or to nurture it. They will either remain mute or give their sullen support to the demagogue or "leader" who elbows his way through the masses offering them protection and food. These are the staple commodities they want and need, and no promise of a better life made possible by democracy can vie with them. As former Senator Paul Douglas once said, "When you offer a starving man a choice between the Four Freedoms and four sandwiches, he always chooses the four sandwiches."

When, however, attention is given to questions of basic order, when roads and streets are made safe, when food, clothing, and shelter are made available, when attention is given to living conditions, when the masses discover they can rear, educate, and marry off their children and leave them an opportunity for a better life, political democracy becomes not only possible, but imperative. For as living standards rise, democracy becomes the only political system through which that better life can be sustained and advanced. And this is to the mutual benefit of all the Americas.

As for time, no nation has fully modernized itself in less than sixty years. The United States took much longer. In eight years Latin America, despite false starts and frustrated hopes, has made more progress than we had any right to expect. Realistically, however, it would be unwise to think in terms of less than thirty years for full-scale modernization of the continent. After eight years the alliance must, therefore, be regarded as in its infancy. Any other view does injustice to Latin America.

And this leads to the need for a sense of scale in our relations with Latin Americans, including a sense of proportion in both the United States and Latin America. We must look at our hemisphere with a new eye of understanding, one that recognizes its importance to the future peace of the world. We cannot take Latin America for granted, believing it will be there when we need it. We need it now no less—and perhaps more—than it needs us, for what happens there in the closing years of this century may well shape the coming years of the next century.

As for Latin Americans, it is time for them to recognize that the United States is not the wielder of the big stick of the 1900s, that we mean what we say about wanting to work with them, that our commitment is to an inter-American community of equal states. In short, they must turn away from memories of the past and turn instead to our mutual hopes for the future.

We talk of destiny, of partnership, of shared hopes and efforts toward hemispheric unity. But what does that destiny look like if our hemisphere ends up half suburb and half slum? Is this the limit we set to the creative, working partnership the American presidents established at Punta del Este to meet the increasing needs of today's "revolution of rising expectations"?

Surely our destiny is more in keeping with the brave new world we have always sought to build. Surely it is more in keeping with our faith that the dream of Simón Bolívar will flourish at last, like the dreams of our own founding fathers—that this hemisphere will grow in prosperity and confidence into a model of how states, with all their diversity of cultures and differences of gifts, can work together to improve and enrich and ennoble their common life.

We shall not do this with cold, lifeless graphs and charts. We shall not do this with Congressional cuts. We shall not do this between today and tomorrow. But with time and with resources, and with the republics of the Americas all working together, it can be done.

TENNESSEE WALKING HORSE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on July 2 I introduced a bill, S. 2543, designed to end the cruel and unnecessary practice of deliberately making sore the feet of the Tennessee Walking Horse in order to alter its natural gait.

This animal is a magnificent show horse. To sore its feet in order to promote its "walk" is a cruel and debasing practice. It is also unnecessary, for the horse can and should be trained, rather than maimed, to walk in its distinctive style.

Hearings on S. 2453 will be held on Wednesday, September 17 by the Commerce Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources and the Environment, beginning at 9:30.

Mr. President, the September 3, 1969, issue of the Christian Science Monitor published an editorial commenting favorably on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD along with certain letters of support for S. 2543 which I have received.

Additionally, I ask unanimous consent that two letters addressed to Mrs. Roger Stevens and Voice Publishing Co. be printed in the RECORD for they offer clear evidence that soring is presently taking place as it has in the past.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 3, 1969]

SORING MUST STOP

Progress in the campaign against the cruel practice of "soring" the feet of Tennessee walking horses has been painfully slow, but the most positive action taken so far seems now to have a fighting chance.

The Tennessee "walker" has a distinctive gait—a quick, high-stepping walk, in which the front feet barely skim the ground and the hind feet bear most of the horse's weight in a long stride. This gait can be developed by training, but it takes time and patience. Unscrupulous owners and trainers have found a shortcut: by various agonizingly cruel devices, they deliberately sore the front feet so that the horses will avoid putting weight upon them. So far, public opinion (perhaps not widely enough expressed) and attempts at legislation have done little to halt this abuse.

Now, Sen. Joseph D. Tydings of Maryland and Congressman G. William Whitehurst of Virginia have introduced identical bills in Senate and House. In effect, these bills would prohibit the shipping of sored horses for exhibition purposes, would prohibit the showing of such horses, and would forbid any horse show in which such horses participate.

The Senate bill is S. 2543, and has been referred to the Senate Commerce Committee, Sen. Warren G. Magnuson, chairman. The House bill is H.R. 12438, and has been referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Hon. Harley O. Staggers, chairman.

Now is the time for the public to ask these two chairmen to see that the bills are reported favorably. Senators may be addressed at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; congressmen at the House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

AUGUST 12, 1969.

MRS. ROGER L. STEVENS,
President, Animal Welfare Institute,
Grand Central Station,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CHRISTINE: This is in reply to your recent letter involving the Tennessee Walk-

ing Horse which I found it necessary to disqualify during the running of the Michigan Horse Shows Association All-Breed Show held at the Michigan State Fairgrounds May 23 through May 25, 1969. The facts are as follows.

Included among the various breeds entered at the Show was a section for Tennessee Walking Horses. Rule XXIII, Part I of the American Horse Shows Association rules provides:

"Horses foaled after January 1, 1965 with any scar (granulated tissue that can be detected from eye level which will not produce hair) on the pastern or coronet areas are ineligible for competition and any substance used in these areas is prohibited, whether or not it alters the natural color of a horse. Judges must disqualify any such entries. Horses having raw or bleeding sores in the pastern or coronet areas from either old or new scars or chain sores shall be disqualified by the Judge for the balance of the show and the owners, trainers and riders are subject to further penalty under the provisions of Rule III, Part I, Sec. 7."

And Part II of the same rule reads as follows:

"Boots will not be dropped or removed for inspection in the ring unless the judge requests it on a specific horse or horses. At any show, a mandatory inspection must be conducted by the Show Veterinarian and the Show Steward not more than ten (10) minutes before the class enters the ring. Horses will be presented for inspection with the boots, which will be worn in the class, in place. The boots will be removed for inspection at the direction of the Steward. The Steward and Veterinarian shall work as a team. The Veterinarian shall inspect the pastern and coronet areas of the horse to determine if they meet the standards set in Part I, General. The Steward shall examine the boots to determine if they meet the standards set in Part I (a) or (b). He shall also observe the height of the heels of the front hooves and where, in his opinion, the height exceeds the standards set in Part I, measurements will be taken. In either case, the Steward will excuse horses not meeting the standards."

In this particular instance, I as Steward, working with the Veterinarian as a team, inspected all the Walking Horse entries just before the beginning of the class. The entries were presented for inspection with the boots on and when I requested that the boots be removed, I noted that in all cases the pastern and coronet areas were heavily coated with a material which prevented the visual inspection for sores. I requested that all such material be wiped off the entries. A couple of the exhibitors protested strenuously that neither the Veterinarian nor the Show Steward had the authority to "touch the horse." I referred, however, to the one sentence in Part II of the rules which says: "The Veterinarian shall inspect the pastern and coronet areas of the horse to determine if they meet the standard set in Part I, General." I told the exhibitors that I interpreted this to mean that the Veterinarian could inspect by physical contact any part of the horse. When I instructed the Veterinarian to put slight pressure on the flesh part of the one entry's pastern area, the horse reacted violently against the pain. With the removal of the material from the pastern area, blood could be observed slowly weeping from the wounds created by chains fastened to the hoof during training periods. I summarily dismissed the horse from showing in that or any subsequent class of the Show. I also observed in every other case obvious scar and granulated tissue around the pastern areas of all the other entries, but this was the only one that showed weeping, bloody sores. In my Steward's report to the American Horse Shows Association, under the paragraph reading "Were there any instances of cruelty to a horse?" I wrote as one of two Stewards: "No instance of cruelty to a horse occurred. The two Stewards and the Veterinarian, however, rejected one horse in the Tennessee Walking Horse Division with running and bleeding sores in the pastern area, with questions on one or two other entries. This Steward believes it most unfortunate that such conditions are tolerated in this Division."

I would appreciate your sending me a copy of the proposed bill to which you refer.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED R. GLANCY, Jr.

SEPTEMBER 4, 1969.

DOUGLAS F. WEBB,
Goodlettsville, Tenn.
VOICE PUBLISHING CO.,
Chattanooga, Tenn.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing you in regard to the recent publicity we as breeders of Tennessee Walking horses have had with primary reference to the soring and scaring of horses in training with "so-called" professional trainers.

We recently had a fine three year old Midnight Duke stud out of a Merry Boy mare and also a six year old stud by a son of Merry Go Boy in training with a "so-called" professional trainer at Lewisburg, Tennessee. These horses were sound as a "gold brick", not a hair off their ankles or legs, when we sent them to this so-called trainer. He was to finish breaking and professionally train the three year old and put some speed on the six year old. After ten (10) months and approximately twelve hundred dollars ($1,200) later paid for training and such, we were compelled to bring them home. They were so scarred around their pastern area that very little hair was left on their feet. We had to treat these horses for damaged legs, scars, callouses, chain bruises, and etc.; and we are still at it.

A lot of talk has been going on as to what to do about such abuse, but nothing constructive has been accomplished so far and probably will not be until the Law-makers outlaw such tactics and put some "teeth" into such laws. If the Association (TWHBA) and Trainer's Association want to do something about these abuses, why not outlaw boots, chains or any other loose objects around or on the horse's ankles or legs. By doing this the so-called "nichol" horse will be eliminated and the natural Walking Horse will be recognized as it should be.

We have raised, bred, and shown the Walking Horse for thirty (30) years and have never shown what people would call a sore horse. When we tell the ring master and/or judge at shows that our horses are clean, they just look at us and say, "Well, they sure are clean"; but when the ties come up, we usually get the Gate, and the sore horses get the winnings.

We contend that this is rotten judging and it seems that the following are the only alternatives to try and clean up this situation: namely, (1) the judges guilty of such tactics as tieing sore horses should be barred from ever judging another horse show, or being licensed to judge any show where the Tennessee Walking Horse is to be shown; and (2) bar every showman or exhibitor from allowing their horse to be shown before any such judge under penalty of $500.00 fine to anyone violating such rules—including the judge and/or exhibitor.

If the powers that be want to stop all this criticism and bad publicity, and really clean up our breed, we dare them to try these recommendations for at least five (5) years. It will take that long to get back our reputation as true Walking Horse showmen.

We are signing our name to this letter, because we are not "chicken" as to whom knows whence it came.

We are not members of the Walking Horse Trainers Association, but are members of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders and Exhibitors Association (TWHBEA) and have been for years.

Sincerely.

DOUGLAS F. WEBB.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 28, 1969.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: I want to express my appreciation and support of your bill S. 2543 to prevent cruel soring of Tennessee Walking Horses.

I saw the Tennessee Walking Horses classes at the Washington International Horse Show last October. I can truthfully say the audience was shocked by the apparent pain the horses were enduring. This deliberate cruelty so inflicted approaches downright torture and certainly should be stopped.

Thanks for your important help.

Sincerely,

CECI CARUSI.

FLORIDA FEDERATION OF HUMANE SOCIETIES, INC.,
Jacksonville, Fla., August 31, 1969.

Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Let me express the appreciation of our Federation for your introducing the bill S. 2543 which should prevent the soring of Tennessee Walking Horses.

The bill definitely has the support of our 5000 or more members of the Florida Federation of Humane Societies and of countless other just ordinary people who are horrified when told the odious practice.

It is amazing how many people never heard of the practice and find it hard to believe that "horse" people could be so unutterably cruel.

I had factual evidence of it some time ago when two Tennessee teachers told me that one of their pupils had told them that one of his jobs was to place acid or other irritants on the delicate part of the horses' front feet at a near-by stable where he was employed part time. Objective: to make them high steppers.

Count us all in as supporters of your bill.

Sincerely yours,

Miss MABEL E. CRAFTS,
Cochairman, Legislative Committee and Chairman Animal Welfare Committee.

RED BANK, N.J.,
August 31, 1969.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: All humanitarians are grateful to you for your support of S. 2543 and all the related efforts to stop cruelty.

Most sincerely,

ABBIE V. STRICKLAND.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
September 4, 1969.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I read in The Christian Science Monitor about your Bill S. 2543, regarding the "Soring" of Horses. I congratulate you on the stand you have taken, and I trust that your Bill can become Law without delay. It is high time that suffering to dumb animals be stopped by Law.

You have my wholehearted support, as well as the support of many other right thinking people.

With every wish for your success.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLOTTE K. SMITH.

CHELSEA, MASS.,
September 1, 1969.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I am writing to express my heartfelt thanks to you for the creation of the bill S. 2543—designed to help prevent the unbelievable cruelty of scoring which is inflicted—nation-wide, upon the Tennessee Walking Horse for show purposes.

This brutal practice that produces such torture for the defenseless horses—has long tortured those of us as well—who so bitterly deplore the senseless suffering endured by all these unshielded creatures.

We will follow with deepest concern and vigilance the outcome of hearings re this all-important bill—S. 2543—scheduled for September 17—in Washington, D.C.

Again thanking you.

Most sincerely,

Miss BEATRICE GRIFFIN.

YORK, ME.

Dear SENATOR: Please accept the sincere thanks of myself and all animal lovers for your bill S. 2543 to protect the Tennessee Walking Horses. The humane leadership of all who sponsored this bill is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BETH H. BANKS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 31, 1969.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

DEAR SENATOR: All humanitarians congratulate you on introducing the bill to prevent the soring of the feet of Tennessee Walking Horses. This cruel practice must end. I feel that people only have to be informed of such cruelty—to be revolted against it.

I urgently hope that S. 2543 becomes law.

Your truly,

JANE M. MCAULIFFE.

BIAFRANS ARE STILL STARVING

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, for more than 2 years a brutal struggle has been waged in West Africa between the country of Nigeria and its secessionist eastern region which now calls itself the Republic of Biafra. During this time perhaps as many as 1½ million innocent victims have died by starvation—most of them women and children. An entire generation of talented and energetic human beings is slowly wasting away.

Many distinguished Members of Congress have joined our President in urging that more be done. Often frustrated by the tangles of the bureaucracy these good intentions have not been translated into the speedy action required. More must indeed be done and done quickly.

As an excellent editorial published in yesterday's Washington Post observes, the blame for the current relief impasse is not easy to ascribe. It now appears as though the Biafran leaders are primarily responsible for the failure to resume Red Cross flights, though given past Nigerian behavior, it can be fairly said that neither side is free from guilt in this terribly complicated tragedy.

In any event, it is neither our responsibility nor our right to comment on the internal workings of other states, though in this case it is a great temptation to do so given the number of lives involved. Moreover, to date, such an approach has appeared, to me at least, to be counterproductive. The one salient fact that cannot be disputed is that we all must redouble our efforts to strengthen existing relief operations and open new avenues as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIAFRANS ARE STILL STARVING

While everybody else was vacationing this summer, the secessionist regime of Biafra went about its by-now routine business: starving. Much of the responsibility of this calamity, which has gone on for so long that few people outside the area pay much attention to it any longer, falls upon the harsh imperatives which halted all relief flights of the International Committee of the Red Cross after early July. Nigeria insisted, as it had a right to do, that relief cargoes touch down in its territory for inspection. Biafra's leadership regarded fulfillment of that demand as an acknowledgement of federal authority, and it preferred to starve its own people instead.

Now, however, Nigeria has magnanimously abandoned its earlier inspection demand. General Gowon, its leader, says Nigeria will allow food planes to fly to Biafra direct from Dahomey; he claims only a right to call the planes down for inspection. Biafra, however, is still balking. The Biafran chief, Colonel Ojukwu, evidently is willing to accede to even more suffering and death, rather than accept the new Nigerian stand. The world's humanitarians, if they are to be fair, ought immediately to turn their appeals from General Gowon to Colonel Ojukwu.

The war, already in its third year, goes on. Nigeria has a heavy logistical preponderance but Biafra stays in the field. So far no effort at outside mediation has gotten anywhere. Lagos won an important public relations victory by the defection to its side of Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, Nigeria's first president and and Ibo tribesman who had formerly supported the Ibo-led administration in Biafra. Addressing himself to the critical issue in the Ibos' fears, he termed reports of Nigerian genocide a "cock-and-bull fairy tale." But General Gowon is under heavy pressure from his own military colleagues to go for a "quick kill," and it is uncertain whether he can demonstrate to Biafra the generosity necessary to capitalize on "Zik's" stand. In these stalemated circumstances, it becomes all the more vital for arrangements to go forward on relief.

SENATOR EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have listened with great appreciation while others have praised Everett McKinley Dirksen for his leadership and his responsibility to that leadership during his long service in the Senate. I have been particularly impressed by the work he has done, especially when I reflect that he left Congress in 1949 with an eye condition which apparently indicated that he would be completely away from active participation. Subsequently, he found medical men who felt that his sight could be improved. He received some expert care.

He became a candidate for the U.S. Senate in 1950. I felt that the reason he was elected to the Senate was the care he displayed in meeting the people at every level. He wore out two automobiles in that campaign. He traveled back and forth throughout his State, over and over, and many participants in that election asked him to do almost impossible tasks while speaking to their local groups. But he took real joy in campaigning. He was determined to participate in every segment of the State and every occupation whether it was banking or partisan activities.

I came to know and like Senator Dirksen when he was serving in the House of Representatives. I sought to persuade him that many of the Truman activities involved all types of leadership. Best of all, he remembered his friends and always had a kind word for those who had known him for a long time.

His family rated very high in his responsibilities. He was not interested merely in official activities in the Senate but recognzed what needed to be done to take care of his friends and his duties. Many people in Illinois can testify to the fact that he searched out their problems and did his best to take care of them.

As a member of the Committee on Finance, he was an excellent representative of his people, yet he never tried to usurp leadership in the Senate. Time after time we all enjoyed his friendly personality, and we will all miss him in this committee as we try to work out a tax proposal. He was a true friend of all of us. I certainly hope that the country will appreciate all that he did.

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM VIETNAM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently, I discussed with the Senate the President's decision to withdraw 25,000 troops from South Vietnam, the date that the promise was made, and the target date for completing the withdrawal.

That was necessary because there were those who were contrasting the number of troops in Vietnam in January with those there in mid-August and using these figures to insinuate that the President was not living up to his commitment. They did this even though they knew he made his promise in June and that the target date was August 31.

Mr. President, August 31 has now come and gone. And more than 25,000 fewer troops are in Vietnam than there were in June.

In fact, as of last Monday, fewer than 509,600 troops were in Vietnam compared with 537,500 on June 7, the day before the President's announcement—that is, a reduction of 27,500.

In addition, and even more important, the Pentagon tells us that it hopes to keep the number of troops there at or below the 515,000 figure. Last January 1, the troop ceiling was 549,500. That figure was never reached, but it allowed for nearly 40,000 more men than are now there.

Mr. President, I bring this subject up only because I hate to see politics played with a war and with our American fighting men. We all have one interest, an honorable peace. I hope we all would support the President's efforts to gain peace. And I further would hope that future criticisms would be based on solid fact, not on political expediency.

ACTIVITIES OF REPRESENTATIVE LEONOR SULLIVAN, OF MISSOURI, IN CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, Representative LEONOR SULLIVAN, of St. Louis, is a public servant of whom Missouri and the Nation can be proud. Her leadership efforts over the years in the fields of consumer education and protection have been outstanding. From her sponsorship of the first food stamp bill to the recent truth-in-lending law, she has been a tireless supporter of legislation benefiting all Americans.

I have the honor and the privilege of serving with Mrs. SULLIVAN in the Missouri delegation, and I ask unanimous consent that an article describing her activities in consumer affairs and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 5, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. SULLIVAN PUSHES FIGHT FOR CONSUMER

(By Lynn Langway)

WASHINGTON, September 5.—The woman who wrote the new truth-in-lending law made her last credit purchase 40 years ago.

"It was a Victrola, and when I found out the little bit I was getting for all that extra cost, I decided to stick to cash," says Representative Leonor K. Sullivan, the only woman on Capitol Hill to head a consumer committee.

A senior member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the St. Louis Democrat is chairman of its subcommittee on consumer affairs. A fighter for strong laws on food, drugs, cosmetics and credit, she was the author of the 1968 Consumer Credit Protection Act, which took effect last month.

"I'd like to think the law will educate consumers, but I have no real conviction that the information it provided will cure credit addiction," says the handsome, silver-haired widow, who has occupied the seat held by her late husband since 1952.

"People buy too readily on credit, without realizing that of course it costs to use someone else's money. They aren't inquisitive enough because they don't want to look dumb," she adds.

Mrs. Sullivan is worried that borrowers will not ask for clarifications of credit charges that merchants and moneylenders now must give. She notes, for example, that many people believe that an "8 per cent discount," loan means an 8 per cent interest rate.

"In fact, if they'd ask, they'd find it means that the 8 per cent is deducted first. You get $92 for a $100 loan. But you pay back on the full amount, so it's really 16 per cent interest," she explains, sitting in a House office feminized by flowering plants, homey blue leather furniture and a bouquet of peonies on the desk.

Leonor Sullivan's consumerism began with a question and she hasn't stopped asking them since. A St. Louis consumer group asked the newly elected Representative to explain the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act to them and "I found I didn't know anything.

"So I began poking around and saw a lot of changes that needed to be made," she says. The search led to sponsorship of the first poultry inspection act and the first food stamp law. She has also been a major force in passing laws on food and color additives, drug control, labeling, and meat inspection. And every year since 1962, she has gamely submitted an omnibus bill that would extend Food and Drug Administration coverage to medical devices, diet foods and cosmetics, none of which are now regulated until proven harmful.

"The FDA doesn't act on anything unless someone is seriously harmed and Congress is often the same. We couldn't get the FDA to act until people went blind from coal tar and we couldn't get drug control until thalidomide.

"The committees are loaded with consumer legislation, but people don't push enough until a tragedy happens, and we're not getting any help from the Nixon Administration," she said.

(Mrs. Sullivan, like other Democrats, is particularly annoyed at lack of response from the Department of Agriculture and Commerce, which have not answered her queries on specific bills and problems.)

The feisty Representative shops and cooks for herself in her small Virginia apartment, decorated with some of her hobby—hooked rugs. She is as fearless about questions at the checkout counter as she is in the Capitol.

"I don't believe in picket-type boycotts, because they've been overused to the point of ineffectiveness. But if the price is too high or the quality is low, I boycott it by not buying.

"And I make sure to tell the supermarket manager why in a loud, clear voice," says the Congressional consumer, who often cooks with stew meat and ground round steak. "They have just as much nutrition and you can dress them up with a little suet," she says firmly.

She uses the same "supermarket voice" in pointing out the costliness of games and stamps, which her subcommittee soon may probe.

"I don't think we should outlaw them, but I'd like to see stamps redeemable in the same stores for cash or discounted goods. I usually ask the checker audibly if this is possible. She answers 'no' and then the next lady in line gets intrigued."

Wise about credit and costs, Mrs. Sullivan is wary over the proliferation of charge cards. "We're all going to rue the day they multiplied, because 5 per cent or more is added to the price of things for everybody, even those who pay cash."

She does admit to one sloppy shopping habit: "I'm an impulsive buyer of clothes, like most women with little time to shop."

The only woman Missouri has sent to Congress, Mrs. Sullivan is enthusiastic about another active woman newer to the scene—Mrs. Virginia Knauer, President Richard M. Nixon's special assistant for consumer affairs.

"She has the enthusiasm and the know-how to give consumers a great boost—if she can get the ear of the President.

"That remains to be seen," concludes Leonor Sullivan and you know she'll be avidly watching and asking questions.

THE STUDENT IN THE MIDDLE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the majority of students in the Nation's colleges do not participate in campus disruptions and, as a matter of fact, many find the activities of the more militant of their fellow students disruptive to the very education which they seek and desire.

The plaint of one such student "in the middle" and the frustration he feels is well stated in a letter from a Queens College undergraduate, Leonard A. Leon. Mr. Leon has sent me a copy of his letter to the President and has given permission for its publication here. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am one of the "apathetic, middle-class bourgeoise" undergraduate college students. The fact that I go to Queens College of the City University of New York is not important. I could go to Harvard, Cornell, Columbia, Stanford or Queensboro Community. I am very grateful for the education I am receiving and feel that many new ideas and experiences have been opened to me. I realize that this is not just the result of going to college, but that fact that I was willing to give of my time, interest and determination to accomplish what I have.

But I am one of the "apathetic, middle-class bourgeoise" college students. This means that I do not belong to Students for a Democratic Society and I do not support their student strikes and disruptions on campus. I do not join counter-demonstrations because these groups use the tactics of the SDS and I have more constructive ways of using my time.

My problem, as with many students today is that I feel that I am being abused. Abused by the small minority of protestors that are disrupting my classes and causing the closing-down of my school. I am also being abused by the power structure that refuses to protect the rights of the majority by enforcing the present laws and halting the illegal actions taken by the minority.

At this point I am frustrated by this contradiction. The laws are being broken and my education is being hindered, but the power structure refuses to protect my rights and interests. Where do I turn? The administration refuses to act and if I join the counter-demonstrations I defeat my purpose. For these reasons I am writing to you, the people of the power structure, so you can readily see my dilemma.

Another characteristic of the "apathetic, middle class bourgeoise" student is patience and understanding. I understand that the present disorders that are sweeping the country are a complex problem and that there are no easy answers. But my patience, although greater than some of these other factions who demand immediate action to alleviate their problems, is not unlimited. There comes a time when the frustration that I am feeling and the millions of other college students like me, will become intolerable. It will not be tomorrow or next week, but a person cannot suffer this kind of abuse, seemingly without recourse, indefinitely.

I sincerely hope that you get the message. I am sure this is one of many letters of this nature that you have received recently. But this cannot go on, so I urge you to put your power behind some constructive measures to alleviate the problem.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD A. LEON.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—XLVI

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the continuing controversy over the use of DDT has come to a head in the last year as more and more evidence has become available to the public regarding the danger to fish, wildlife, the total world environment and potentially to human health.

Conservationists and scientists have testified to the already alarming death toll of certain wildlife species which are threatened with total extinction because of the presence of DDT in their systems and have revealed results of studies which link this highly persistent, toxic

pesticide to stomach and liver ailments in man.

Much has been written about this issue. An article published recently in the Eau Claire, Wis., Daily Telegram offers a good summary of the status of the controversy on the national scene. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN NOT ALONE IN DDT FIGHT

(By Sherry Conohan)

Michigan has banned the sale of DDT.

Arizona has banned its use.

In Wisconsin, the Natural Resources Department recently concluded hearings on a request for a ban and is considering whether to impose one.

The Illinois Legislature sent a bill to Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie for his signature giving the state Departments of Agriculture and Public Health the authority to regulate the sale and use of pesticides. The Minnesota Legislature passed a bill authorizing the state secretary of agriculture to ban the use of any pesticide.

Other legislation dealing with DDT is pending in a number of states but the greatest concern in the building controversy is centered in the Great Lakes area where high concentrations of DDT have been found in fish.

DDT is a nerve poison. The initials are an abbreviation for the chemical dichlorodiphenyl-tricholoroethane, a chlorinated hydrocarbon. The discovery in 1939 of the insecticidal properties of DDT led to the development in the 1940s of a series of chlorinated hydrocarbons for use as pesticides. Paralysis spreads from any part of the insect body that comes in contact with DDT.

Some scientists and conservationists contend that DDT has contributed to the extinction of certain wildlife species and poses a serious threat to the health of man, while others, such as Dr. Gordon Guyer, head of the Michigan State University pesticide research center, dismiss the warnings as overblown.

Guyer said coho salmon and other fish caught in the Great Lakes are "perfectly safe to eat." The pesticide controversy he said, has raised a scare which is not founded in scientific fact.

"We need to take it out of the press and put it back into the scientific ground," he said. "When anything gets this much publicity, there are misunderstandings that develop and spread."

But the controversy cannot be suppressed and, in fact, drew wide public interest when the Federal Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in early March seized 28,150 pounds of coho salmon caught in Lake Michigan on the grounds the fish contained dangerous concentrations of DDT.

A few weeks later, on April 16, the Michigan Agriculture Commission imposed the ban on sale of DDT in that state. The ban was appealed early this month by four pesticide manufacturers. Hearings on the appeal were scheduled for June 18.

Subsequent to the imposition of the ban in Michigan, the FDA set an interim maximum of 5 parts per million DDT for fish sold in interstate commerce. The interim maximum is to remain in effect until studies can be completed and permanent standards set.

The World Health Organization has set a DDT tolerance level of 7 parts per million.

The Lake Michigan fish seized by the FDA contained up to 19 parts per million DDT residue. Concentrations of up to 2,000 parts per million have been found in fish in Clear Lake in California.

Figures from the National Agricultural Chemicals Association in Washington, D.C., show use of DDT in the United States has declined significantly in recent years. In the 1966–67 crop year, 40 million pounds of DDT were used (including 27 million pounds in agriculture) compared to 71 million pounds 10 years earlier in 1956–57.

A spokesman for the association attributed the reduction to the development of other chemicals that are more effective than DDT.

An encyclopedia says the average sized person in the United States in the mid-1960s contained in his body tissues about 7 parts per million DDT. In recent testimony before a congressional committee, David Brower, former executive director of the Sierra Club, put the figure for an average person at 12 parts per million.

Arizona, in January, outlawed the use of DDT for agricultural and commercial purposes for a one-year period. The ban, which will be either renewed or lifted in January, 1970, by the State Board of Pest Control Applicators, was levied after alfalfa and other forage crops had become contaminated by DDT to the extent the DDT content in milk had risen to levels higher than allowed by federal laws.

In Minnesota, public agencies stopped using DDT in 1962 for spraying forests and in metropolitan areas.

In New York, the use of DDT has been banned since 1964 on all state owned lands under the jurisdiction of the state Conservation Department.

In Wisconsin, the Natural Resources Department has prohibited the use of DDT on state-owned lands and some Milwaukee suburbs have discontinued the use of DDT for tree spraying.

The DDT question perhaps has been given its best public airing in the lengthy hearings conducted by the Wisconsin Natural Resources Department.

The hearings were ordered after three citizens groups—the Citizens Natural Resources Association, the Wisconsin Division of the Izaak Walton League of America and the Michigan Audubon Society Inc.—petitioned the department for a ban on DDT, contending the chemical has entered state waters and polluted the environment.

Twenty-seven days of testimony ensued over a six-month period beginning Dec. 2 and concluding May 21, with chemical companies and agricultural interests waging the fight against the petition. Attorneys for both sides have said any decision will be appealed through the courts.

Environmental scientists favoring the ban on DDT made these points:

DDT does not break down and is highly mobile, spreading throughout the world.

DDT has been traced to the extinction of various forms of wildlife, particularly birds. Witnesses said DDT throws the birds' calcium-producing mechanism out of balance, causing them to produce thin-shelled eggs that often do not hatch.

DDT is having an unknown, harmful effect on man.

Dr. Richard M. Welch, Terrytown, N.Y., a biochemical pharmacologist, testified that concentrations of DDT far below those found in man produce alterations in the sexual mechanisms of both male and female rats. He said DDT also interferes with common drugs by causing the body to break down the drugs faster than normal.

Opponents of the ban claimed DDT is safe and that it does not have the effects attributed to it by scientists supporting the ban. They also argued that DDT is the only pesticide that can be used economically to control some insect pests.

Dr. Weyland Hayes, an official of the World Health Organization, testified: "I think it is safe."

Hayes described FDA studies on DDT, saying: "Volunteers were fed doses of DDT 200 times what you and I would get every day for 12 months and they showed no ill effects."

In New York State, traces of DDT have been found in fish since 1960, but the state Health Department is not worried about any "immediate health risk." Health Department scientists estimate a person would have to eat 70 pounds of fish a day to be affected adversely by the current levels of DDT found in the state's fish.

ARCHIE MOORE FIGHTS FOR YOUTH

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, one of my close friends and fellow Californians, Archie Moore, former light heavyweight champion, is engaged in a vital and praiseworthy battle which is as challenging as any he faced during his long career in the ring. This battle is to save youths from a life of juvenile delinquency and push them in the right direction so that they may become productive and successful citizens of our country. His own city is as proud of him and his work as he is of San Diego. Certainly, this is a kind of program that deserves more attention and support. I ask unanimous consent that two articles praising Archie Moore be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News, Feb. 13, 1969]

MOORE FIGHTS FOR YOUTH—FORMER LIGHT HEAVYWEIGHT CHAMPION VISITS SAGINAW

(By Joe Hart)

They called him ancient Archie Moore a decade ago when he was light heavyweight boxing champion of the world.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. The mustachioed and goateed Moore, with flecks of gray streaking through his hair, is ageless. He is blessed with the eternal spirit of youth.

Moore, an unscarred veteran of 235 professional bouts for more than a quarter of a century, was fighting for the youth of America this morning when he began a busy two-day schedule of appearances in the Saginaw area as a Boy Scout executive at a press conference at Saginaw High.

"I am not a civil rights leader, as some people say. I'm a leader of youth," Moore told a youthful audience of high school reporters. "True, I seek equality. But the only way that can be accomplished is to motivate the youth of our nation. This must be done or all the undeveloped talents will go down the drain."

What is Moore's primary job with the Boy Scouts of America? "I am especially interested in community relations, particularly in areas where the Boy Scouts have not been able to establish a foothold. What I am trying to do is to open up opportunities for youngsters of all races and creeds. Not only for jobs, but for positions in administrative posts, particularly in corporations, and in the professions."

Moore warned that parents can make or break a child. "A father or mother who does not provide the proper food or clothing, or discourages an ambitious child from obtaining an education can reap unmeasurable harm."

What can a neglected youth do? "To keep a parent from killing his spirit, he must have fierce determination to succeed."

Archie should know. He spent time in a reform school as a youngster. "When I got out, I wanted to become a good fighter. One night, while I was still a 19-year-old amateur boxer, I sparred with a good pro in a gymnasium. When I got home my mother told me I would never amount to anything hanging around gyms. It was exactly 20 years from that day that I became world champion."

How old is Moore? "I never reveal my true age." But according to Ring Book and Boxing Encyclopedia, Archie was born Dec. 13, 1913 in Benoit, Miss. He knocked out the Poco Kid in the second round in his first professional fight on Jan. 31, 1936 in Hot Springs, Ark.

Moore became the lightweight heavyweight champion of the world Dec. 17, 1952 when he won a 15-round decision from Joey Maxim in New York. He fought classic battles against the likes of Bobo Olson, Yolande Pompey, Tony Anthony and Yvonne Durelle. He twice tried to capture the world heavyweight title. In 1955, Moore was knocked out by champion Rocky Marciano in the ninth round in New York. Floyd Patterson scored a fifth round knockout over Moore in 1956 in a battle for Marciano's vacated heavyweight crown at Chicago.

Moore's last fight was in 1962. Would you believe at the tender age of 49? An upstart named Cassius Clay ended Archie's career with a fourth round knockout. In his 235 fights, Moore knocked out 137 of his foes and was the winner of 54 decisions. That's a lot of mileage for a boxer.

But ageless Archie was raring to go this morning. Following a student assembly at Saginaw High, he attended a combined luncheon of the five Kiwanis Clubs in Saginaw at the YWCA. Another student assembly at Arthur Eddy School and a meeting with inter-city project workers kept him busy until tonight when he will be the speaker at the Eagle Scout Recognition Dinner at the Bay City Country Club.

Tomorrow, Moore has morning meetings with community leaders and a luncheon with youth agency directors from Saginaw and Bay City at the YMCA. A student assembly at Washington Junior High School in Bay City in the afternoon and an open forum meeting for inner-city boys and parents at UAW Hall (Sixth Street) will conclude Moore's whirlwind visit to Saginaw.

How's that for going 10 fast rounds?

The former light-heavyweight boxing champion of the world, Archie Moore, last night "sparred" with some 20 West End youngsters at the Goodwill Industries plant on Ocean terrace.

Throwing questions instead of right hooks, the former fighter turned youth leader demonstrated the value of "position."

Over 300 people, many of them Boy Scouts and Cub Scouts, turned out to greet Mr. Moore, whose visit was co-sponsored by the Pomperaug Council of the Boy Scouts of America and the Greater Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce Social Services committee.

"You, you, you, you and you," the leader "volunteered" some 20 recruits, a number of them Boy Scouts in uniform, a couple of them girls.

Because, he said, like any group, they would need organizational discipline to function properly, the leader lined up the "volunteers" by height from tallest to shortest, and in sharp, rapid-fire commands, he ran them over a series of mental hurdles.

"You people can do what I tell you to because I knew you were tremendous when I picked you; all you've got to do is try," he said.

Setting his stage to get everyone present involved, the ex-champion said, "We're going to need judges, we don't want any drop-outs, but we're going to need judges," and turning to the audience he said, "You people are the judges."

"Repeat after me, judges, 'Sorry about that.' That's what you say when somebody up here doesn't do what I tell him," the leader told the group.

Then he ran the recruits through their paces.

"Tell me this, all of you have younger brothers and sisters or cousins going to school. What one thing would you tell the youngster not to do while he's in school?

Hands at their sides and feet apart, one at a time until all had finished, the volunteers shouted out "Fight unless he had to, steal, swear, not take part in athletics, smoke, play in the streets, drink, skip classes, beat up the teacher, write nasty things on the wall."

Mr. Moore then told the group to do again what they had just completed and cautioned them not to repeat any of the given suggestions. Applying pressure, he said, "You've got until I count three or the judges will count you out."

This task completed, the leader asked the youngsters, "When he gets out of school, what would you want that young person to become?"

The 20 youths had the "judges" literally rolling in laughter, as they stuttered and stumbled their way through occupations ranging from truck driver, to dictator.

Mr. Moore toughened the task, warning no repetitions, and the group exhausted possibilities ranging this time from X-ray technician to disc jockey. Five times the leader tested their ingenuity, interrupting frequently with "Come on baby, you can do it, you've got 'til 3."

This completed, Mr. Moore explained that there were many occupations open, and many people who "will help you get there."

PHILOSOPHY UNPACKED

Unpacking some of his own philosophy, he added: "The word to get you there is position. Position is your stance in life, and the man who stands neutral stands for nothing."

Over and over again the fighter shouted the command "Position," and the youths assumed the fighter's stance, fists set and ready to throw a punch. On the command "As you were," hands fell to sides.

Then, with the word, "out" he had the youngsters strike out and recoil their punches until they were able to perform to his satisfaction.

JUDGES PUT IN ACTION

Now putting the "judges" into action and cautioning "no repetitions this time," the leader again asked the group the two questions asked earlier.

With much laughter and many calls of "Sorry about that," all but five of the 20 were eliminated.

The five, whom Mr. Moore then termed "winners" were singled out to sing any song of their liking.

Most shuffled about, nervous, and had further difficulty singing. One, instead of singing, said he'd "appreciate a seat."

Another, Eddie Burns, from Explorer Post 49, quieted the gathering with a notable rendition of "What Kind of a Fool Am I?"

Applause from the audience as Mr. Moore placed his hand over the head of each contestant choose Mr. Burns the winner, and he received a payment in cash from the ex-champion.

Concluding, Mr. Moore made certain to point out that it was not important whether anyone had a good voice. What is important, he said, is that they all tried.

INVITED TO TEEN CENTERS

James Barrett, as A B C D worker, praised the demonstration, and on behalf of the poverty agency invited the boxer to visit the teen centers throughout the city.

He said what Mr. Moore, founder-director of ABC (Any Boy Can) clubs had done in the demonstration was meaningful.

"It showed us that any of us can, as long as we feel that we can. Nothing in the world is great enough to make us feel that we cannot excell. Mr. Moore's record is what it is because of what he himself has done."

Mr. Moore who won 187 of his 229 fights and who with 136 knockouts set an all time knockout record, addressed a Chamber of Commerce luncheon yesterday afternoon at the Stratfield Motor Inn.

COMPARED TO MUSIC

The "champ" likened his work with youth to a piece of music in which every one must face each other, whether black or white, in perfect harmony.

"EGBDF—every good boy does fine," Mr. Moore stated, "and this involves communication and appreciation of youth working together."

Mr. Moore, who is the founder of the ABC (Any Boy Can) clubs, stressed that any boy who wants to get ahead must have help.

"I have often heard of the self-made man," he said, "but I do not know of one, for everyone needs help, whether spiritual or physical, to get him motivated."

He stressed that those who are willing to help and give aid to youth must follow through with their efforts, and not leave them high and dry.

ARCHIE MOORE'S GREATEST FIGHT IS NOW

(By Duane Valentry)

Let's take a hasty inventory of the things which you believe are keeping you from success?

Are you getting along in years and feel you've "missed the boat"?

Archie Moore did not become light-heavyweight champion of the world until he had passed his thirty-ninth birthday.

Are you overworked and in a menial job?

Archie Moore fried chicken for thirteen hours a day, seven days a week until he could no longer stand upright.

Is your background one of poverty or lack of security?

Archie Moore is the son of a Mississippi farm laborer. He lived with his aunt when his family broke up. He is a school dropout.

Is your health poor?

Archie Moore, overworked and undernourished, weighed only 100 pounds when he was twenty-eight.

With this type of background what would you expect a man like this to be doing with his life now that he is no longer champion?

Archie Moore, today, is actively engaged in helping the nation he loves through his unique juvenile program entitled Any Boy Can. Abbreviated to initials, ABC is being seriously considered in many cities across the country as one possible answer to civil unrest.

Archie still looks as if he could handle himself in the ring against most of the current crop of fighters and his "students" in the ABC program listen to him with unusual respect. He teaches his boys to be fearless, how to defend themselves, how to walk away from a fight and how to take a licking, if it comes, with good grace. He knows how to do each. In 1955 he challenged world heavyweight champion, Rocky Marciano and he lost. He also fought Durelle, Patterson, Clay, and others—often winning, sometimes losing.

"As a boxer, Moore had a way of creating excitement inside and outside the ring," says a reporter. "His persistent pursuit of the heavyweight champion was a masterpiece. He finally got his fight, lost it, but covered himself with glory. Marciano, who never lost, has frequently said that Archie was his best and most dangerous opponent."

Now, Archie Moore is engaged in his greatest battle as he attempts to inculcate a sense of dignity, respect for others, and pride, in children who know only a world of poverty, vice, and despair.

Recently crowned "Mr. San Diego of 1968" by his proud home town, Moore is known as a humanitarian as well as a great fighter who holds the all-time ring record for knocking out 140 opponents—some of them long after even his friends thought he should quit. Said the president of the Grant Club—a group of citizens and businessman—on presenting him with the honorary title:

"He is being honored because he has brought national and international fame to San Diego and has depicted the city as a

place where people live and work together in religious, patriotic and civic endeavor."

"I try to work along uncomplicated lines as much as possible," Archie says, "so as not to be confused. At night before bed is research time for me. What did I accomplish today? Whom did I do wrong? I try not to make the same mistakes over again. I feel I'd rather hurt myself than my neighbor because I believe I could take it and keep going."

When he meets a man, Archie always learns his name and address. As soon as he can he sends him a postcard, even if it is only a few words of greeting. His friends number in the hundreds, are intensely loyal, and include the high and the low—from sparring partners to presidents. Though he is always colorful and has a way of making headlines, his good deeds do not, although he is one of the real givers whenever he senses a need, contributing his time and money freely, irrespective of age, creed or color.

"The young people of today think they have a hard lot," he says. "They should have been around in the '30's when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood.

"We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your 'guaranteed national income' . . .! The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!"

"But belief that God helps those who try to help themselves could be construed more than one way," says this literate and successful businessman. "The sharp businessman, the cold, crafty landlord, the loan shark, and the money lenders certainly help themselves. But if they take undue advantage of their clients, they are not adhering to the Golden Rule. My life has always been lived around the Golden Rule, 'Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.'"

In starting his ABC program, Archie wrangled a store front, a set of punching bags and a regulation boxing ring out of a chain store and opened the doors to the kids who thronged the streets and were creating a serious problem by vandalism. Though some came to sneer they stayed to become students and the vandalism stopped nearly overnight. Noting his success the American Savings and Loan agreed to back him for the duration of a pilot program in Vallejo, California.

No boy who comes to ABC can have been more tried by circumstances than the pleasant guy who now takes the time to guide them ("If some bigot can misguide, I can guide," he says.) They're too young—but their elders can tell them about a man flattened in a fight in Montreal against Durelle who got up from the canvas not once, but four times, to score a knockout. They also remember the man who didn't quit when beaten by Marciano but tried for the heavyweight title again only to be beaten by Patterson.

They can tell of his stupendous wins too. Famed sportswriter Jim Murray says of him:

"If you rent a computer and program yourself a prize fighter, you couldn't do much better than Archibald Lee Moore. He was the best mechanical fighter ever to hit a weigh-in. He was a slum kid who saw America from the back of a bus, the bottom of a freight car, the windows of a flophouse. Archie never owed America a thing. But he never figured it owed him anything, either. He never joined the Boy Scouts, or went to the aquarium, and the Junior Chamber of Commerce wasn't after him to sign up until he was too old. He was voted 'Mr. San Diego' because of all people, he's trying to save America from itself."

There have been some disappointments in acceptance of ABC. Though he has offered it to the government and recently spoke before a Congressional Committee, many promises from politicians and businessmen have yet to materialize. However, many people feel it is merely a matter of time; that the Archie Moore ABC project is one of the better solutions yet offered and as such must be given proper recognition.

Archie is without bitterness as he looks back over his eventful life, much of it spent slugging away at obstacles.

"I love God, and God loves me. He has been good to me all my life even when I thought man did not give me my rightful breaks. I can only figure God was teaching me a great virtue—patience."

Who is there to say that the patient, old champion will not win his greatest fight, help bring dignity to his people . . . and peace to a troubled land?

THE GRADUATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES AND OBLIGATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, thousands of speeches were made to graduating classes this June. Many of these speeches were inspiring, educational, and informative. Earlier this summer, at the graduation exercises of Northwood High School, of Silver Spring, Md., David Gordon, president of the June 1969 class, in his welcoming address emphasized the role of the young graduate not only in participating in meeting the problems of the Nation and the community, but in doing so responsibly and with an understanding of their complexities. He urged the students to work with the older generation in making changes that are constructive. He stressed the need for students to develop their ideals to achieve practical results, and to be honest both with themselves and with others.

I believe young David's message contains sound advice which will be of interest to Members of Congress and to the public; I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRADUATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES AND OBLIGATIONS

Senator Tydings, Mrs. Hilberg, Mr. Packard, and other members of the administration, members of the faculty, parents and friends, fellow students of the Northwood Class of '69. At last, after struggling through three years of senior high school, we are finally ready to graduate. Soon we will receive our diplomas and many of us will be saying goodbye to our friends. Thus our Commencement Exercises marks the end of our high school education.

Yet this is not the end. As you know, the word "commencement" means the beginning, because this ceremony marks the beginning of our actual involvement in society. Until now, youth has been called "the future leaders of the world." Now, some of society's controls are being handed over to us. We are going out and filling one of society's jobs, and in doing so, we are beginning to have a meaningful say in how those jobs shall be done. We are going into the colleges and universities, the educational institutions upon which our nation relies heavily for much of its research and knowledge. Therefore we are beginning to have a meaningful say in our nation's affairs. Now we will have the chance to perpetuate those things we have seen in the world that we feel are right, and to change or abolish those things which we feel are wrong. Thus our graduation is hardly an end, but rather the beginning of our generation's meaningful involvement in society.

What gives us the right to have such a meaningful say in what society does? First of all, we have had about eighteen years experience in this world, during which time we feel we have become more fully acquainted with the ways in which our society operates. Secondly, as shown by our statements and ideas on various issues facing us, such as the Vietnam war, the grape boycott, education, Biafra, and many others, we are aware of our society's problems and have already started working on solutions. In many cases our teachers comment that we are often more aware and educated in these issues than are our parents. Finally, these problems of society do not belong only to the members of the older generation because if solutions to these problems are not found, we will suffer the consequences along with our parents. If another great and crippling economic depression hits this nation again as it did in the 30's, we will go hungry just as much as our parents will. If the air and waters become strongly polluted, our bodies will suffer just as much as our parents'. Yes, even if the world is torn by a nuclear *war*, we will die the same as our parents. Therefore, these problems belong just as much to us as they do to the older generation, and therefore, as genuine members of our society, we not only have a right, but an obligation, to help in the solving of these problems.

Our generation will face numerous and extremely difficult problems, all of which will demand solutions. There will be no easy answers to the problems, and some of them may have no definite answers at all. As an example of the type of problem we will encounter, a scientist who spoke to one of the classes on "Problems of the Twentieth Century" stated that in a few years, man would have mastery over his own genes. Thus, by manipulating the genes of an unborn baby, he would be able to make that child into a musician, a mathematical genius, a great politician, a soldier, or a moron. The problem, however, is, who will decide what the child is to be and who will do the manipulating? If a nation wants a powerful army, will it have the right to manipulate genes to make nothing but soldiers and superpatriots? Shall a doctor who is prejudiced against another group of people manipulate genes so as to make morons out of that group? Who shall determine how many of each type of child is to be born? Maybe we can't conceive of this problem ever being a reality, but then many of today's problems seemed farfetched only a generation ago. We will have to find answers to this problem just as we will have to find answers to others. What are we going to do about air and water pollution? How are we to match a worldwide growing population with adequate food production? What are we going to do about the extreme poverty in our world? In our own country, how are we going to do away with racial and religious prejudices that have been brewing for hundreds of years? How are we in the Western Hemisphere going to live peacefully with those peoples of the East, some of whom are now being taught to hate and kill us? Yes, in a world where the two primary powers are increasing the number and the force of their thousands of nuclear warheads which are aimed at each other and ready on a minute's notice to be fired, how and for how long are we to maintain peace in the world? These problems are some of the most complex, if not the most difficult and serious, problems mankind has ever faced, and these are the problems that we are going to have to solve. We can't shy away from them. As members of our society,

as responsible people who are beginning to take control of society's affairs, we are obligated at least to try to solve them, and try we must. As Richard Lloyd Jones once said, "The men who try to do something and fail, are infinitely better than those who try to do nothing and succeed." The consequences for doing nothing are far too grave for us not to act. We must seek answers to these problems if we are to survive.

Our generation has not been standing by, though, and doing nothing. We have arrived at proposals for solving these problems. We have looked at our present high school education, seen a number of faults that need to be corrected, and have proposed ways of correcting them; for example, we have asked that the grading system be reviewed, that there be a greater choice of electives. We have done the same with local, national, and international issues. But one major error in our proposals and solutions is that too often they are overly idealistic. Idealism itself is not a flaw. To balance the more practical and conservative minds of our parents, we need idealistic thoughts in our society. But often our plans and proposals lack practical application and therefore appear vague and impossible to carry out. Just to give a small example, you know that I have been asking many students to take a poll of mine on education at Northwood. One of the questions on the poll reads as such: "What improvements would you like to see at Northwood concerning the manner in which courses are taught?" When I posed this question to one typical student, he replied that Northwood needed better teachers. I asked him what he meant by "better teachers." He replied, "Teachers who are interesting and make their classes interesting." But how is a teacher interesting and how does he make his class interesting? He answered, "By motivating the students." But exactly how does a teacher motivate the students? "Well," he continued, "like one of my teachers for example. She takes an interest in us. She motivates us. She's just interesting, that's all." Notice there was no mention of self-motivation. The student's ideas are excellent, but poor as proposals. Imagine that same student addressing a group of young teachers and telling them how to become better instructors by following those undefined terms. Imagine again the effect a young person would have on the Paris Peace Negotiations by telling the different sides not to fight but to sit down and love each other. Our ideas are great, but we must be able to make them explicit, specific, and practical before we can expect other people to accept them. All of us want better teachers, and I'm sure some teachers wish they had better students, but it's what better teachers are and how to go about getting them that is the problem, just as how to go about ending the Vietnam war is also the problem.

How do we then formulate workable ideas? The answer to this question is first to be thoroughly acquainted with the problem; its causes, its history and all other ramifications—what solutions that have been proposed have worked and why—those solutions that have been proposed and have failed, and why. This last point we sometimes tend to forget. Most of our ideas are not new. Everyone knows how old the concept of worldwide peace through love is, and yet few of us have studied the numerous attempts of the different religions to put this concept into universal practice.

Another example is in foreign affairs. Many people feel the United States should first concern itself with its domestic problems and limit her involvement with other countries. What these people have forgotten, or don't know, is that the United States had such an isolationist policy before World Wars I and II. If, however, after we have gone back and studied the historical and present difficulties connected with our proposals, modify them, and try to put them into effect. Thus, before we attempt to tackle these problems we must be fully prepared, fully educated.

Yes, graduation is the beginning of our generation's actual involvement in society's affairs. Soon we will be grappling with the problems our society faces. But let us remember to work with each member of society, young and old, in solving these problems.

Parents, as you realize that you do not possess all of the answers, please also realize that you are not the only ones capable of providing these answers. And just as the older generation should listen to us and consider our proposals, let us always seek to be heard, but let us never cease to listen. Let us be fully informed before we confront the problems and let us have a will to solve them.

Last week, one of my teachers commenting on students finding fault with our educational system, asked the question, "Why not become teachers if you see faults you want to correct?" He was making two points. One, that students who have complaints about the educational system should also look at the problem from a teacher's point of view: and two, that if we honestly feel certain changes should be made in the system, we should be committed enough to become teachers and make those changes. These are points that apply to almost any profession in society. Therefore you who will become our teachers, go out and right those faults you see in our present educational system. You who will become our politicians, go out and tackle those local, national, and international political problems that face us. And let us all be fully committed to enter the arena of the world to fight and tackle these problems that will confront us. But when we enter that arena, let us not be so weak in foundation that we are immediately thrown out on our heads; nor let us be so weak in commitment that we are defeated within a minute. Let us be educated and prepared so that we stay in that ring, that we solidly come to grips with our foes, and that we win. And as we are struggling in that sometimes vicious but always challenging arena of the world, we will look back on our educational institutions. We will look back at Northwood High School and say "thank you."

So my fellow students, let us continue to dissent, but let us dissent with a purpose. Let us change, but let us change constructively. Let us challenge, but let us challenge with respect. Let us be moral in all our undertakings, but let us recognize our own imperfections. Let us withdraw from society's wrongdoings but let us not withdraw from society. Let us dream, but let us not hide in our dreams of halucination. Let us love one another, but let us love honestly.

My fellow classmates, I thank you for your cooperation during our senior year. I congratulate you upon graduating and I wish you success in the future. To our parents, teachers, and friends, the Northwood Class of '69 expresses its thanks, because without your understanding, your compassion, and sacrifices, many of us would not have reached this commencement day. Thank you very much.

OBSTACLES TO FREE TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an unusually perceptive article written by Prof. Richard N. Gardner and published in the London Times be printed in the RECORD.

Professor Gardner, an internationally recognized expert and author of "Sterling-Dollar Diplomacy" examines the growing debate on Britain's application to join the Common Market and the alternate idea of a North Atlantic Free Trade Area—NAFTA—and the obstacles both in Europe and America to freer trade.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the London Times, July 29, 1969]

HURDLING THE TRADE BARRIERS

The United States and Britain have had two opportunities in this generation to move the world into a regime of free trade.

The first was during the war, when the British Government sought American approval for James Meade's plan for a Commercial Union. The second was in the early 1950s, when France and other Continental countries sought British and American endorsement of an automatic formula for leveling tariffs across the board.

Unfortunately, the United States Government rejected the first initiative, and both the British and American Governments rejected the second. Had either of these proposals been accepted, the developed countries of the non-Communist world would today be enjoying free trade, or something very close to it in the industrial sector.

The problems of reconciling British and American trade interests and those of other countries with a European Common Market would either not exist or would be much more manageable.

We have not, however, done too badly. When the Kennedy Round cuts are completed in 1972, tariffs among the industrialized countries will be down to an average of about 10 per cent. On a broad range of industrial products, we will be within striking distance of free trade.

Yet quotas, border taxes, discriminatory procurement policies and other non-tariff barriers (as well as some severely protective tariffs) continue to obstruct trade in important sectors. Agricultural protectionism continues unabated on both sides of the Atlantic. And even the Kennedy Round accomplishments are threatened by protectionist rumblings in the United States and elsewhere.

In trade policy, as in other matters, one seldom stands still. It seems likely that we will move in the 1970s toward the free trade goal or slip backward into self-defeating policies of economic nationalism. As a matter of practical politics, it will be difficult to hold on to past gains and overwhelm the last bastions of protectionism in the most sensitive industries unless there is some kind of "grand design" in which the major trading countries commit themselves to the progressive elimination of protection by a fixed target date.

We are fortunate, therefore, that bold spirits in Britain and the United States are now exploring the possibilities of doing this. Among the most significant contributions are the pamphlets that have been issued by the Atlantic Trade Study in Britain, some of which have recently been revised and published in a book edited by Professor Harry G. Johnson.[1]

The Atlantic Trade Study was launched at a time when General de Gaulle's veto on British entry into the Common Market looked as if it would last indefinitely. At least one of the authors represented in Professor Johnson's book considers the formation of a North Atlantic Free Trade Area as a superior alternative and others regard it as a viable approach if British entry is barred.

The participants in Nafta, as they see it, would be Britain, the United States, Canada, the Commonwealth, some of Britain's Efta partners, and possibly, Japan.

To this American observer, the concept of a Nafta excluding the E.E.C. does not seem

[1] *New Trade Strategy for the World Economy*, edited by Harry G. Johnson, London, Allen and Unwin, 1969.

fully convincing. The reason is not only that, with the passing of de Gaulle, the powerful political and economic case for Britain's entry into Europe justifies a further try. It is that American participation in a Nafta excluding the E.E.C. simply does not look like a political possibility.

The United States is a global power, and will be most skeptical of any trade design that excludes the major countries of the European Continent. The United States needs the participation of the surplus countries of Europe to rebuild its lost trade surplus and resolve its balance-of-payments difficulties.

Moreover, the last protectionist ramparts in the United States are unlikely to fall as long as there is substantial European protectionism against American products.

Fortunately, most of the authors in Professor Johnson's book, including Professor Johnson himself, seem to regard Nafta as synonymous with a broadly based, multilateral free trade initiative open to E.E.C. participation and operating within the framework of Gatt.

Such an approach might appeal to the United States as a way of eliminating, or at least substantially reducing, the margin of discrimination against non-participants in the E.E.C. and also as a way of preserving a measure of economic and political unity among America's major trading partners and political friends.

The hard questions, of course, are whether the E.E.C. would really be prepared to eliminate its common external tariff and whether there could be sufficient freeing of agricultural trade to persuade major agricultural exporters like the United States to offer free trade on industrial goods.

If the answer to either of these questions turns out to be no, it is doubtful that the United States will then form a Nafta without the E.E.C. For the reasons given above it will probably seek something less than complete free trade—the elimination of tariffs in certain sectors where there is a perceived general interest in trade freedom, and modest measures of liberalization in other areas.

The United States will not be ready for a bold trade initiative, in any case, until the Kennedy Round cuts are completed and until it liquidates the political and economic consequences of its tragic military involvement in Vietnam.

The once powerful liberal and internationalist constituency, now embittered, divided and inwardlooking, has to be rebuilt.

The dangerous rate of inflation must be reduced and the United States trade surplus at least partly restored. Hopefully by 1973 a United States Administration will have the freedom to opt for a bold trade initiative that the Nixon Administration does not have now.

That is four years off, it is true, but not so long in the perspective of history considering the magnitude of the objective.

We can use the four years to consolidate the accomplishments of the Kennedy Round, explore the possibilities of Britain's entry into Europe, begin the assault on nontariff barriers, reform our inadequate international monetary system, and lay the political and economic groundwork for a free trade initiative.

That should be enough to keep us busy.

GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING URGED RATIFICATION OF 1925 GENEVA PROTOCOL ON CBW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in 1926, 8 years following World War I, the first war in which chemical agents were extensively used, General of the Armies John J. Pershing sent a letter to the Committee on Foreign Relations warning of the dangers of such warfare, stating:

Chemical warfare should be abolished among nations as abhorrent to civilization. It is fraught with the gravest danger to noncombatants and demoralizes the better instincts of mankind. It is unthinkable that civilization would deliberately embark on such a course.

The Senate at the time was considering singing the 1925 Geneva protocol prohibiting the use of any kind of gas or bacteriological methods of warfare. It decided not to ratify that agreement in spite of General Pershing's argument. Instead, the Senate chose to forget about the issue, and the War Department began a massive program of research, development, testing, and storing of chemical-biological warfare agents. By the end of World War II, for example, the United States was far ahead of the Nazis in the development of the means of germ warfare.

Mr. President, the Senate has before it a resolution calling on the President to resubmit the Geneva protocol to the Senate for its advice and consent to its ratification.

I urge the passage of a no-first-use agreement—such as the Geneva protocol of 1925—to make absolutely clear the position of the United States and to forestall Soviet and other international propaganda about our failure to ratify such a declaration.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, an interview with Secretary of Commerce Stans, published in U.S. News & World Report of September 8 represents the best capsule summary I have seen of the international trade problems which we face as a nation. As the interview implies, the issue is complex. Our balance of payments, tax system, unemployment situation, agriculture, banks, Federal Reserve policy, manufacturing productivity, and diplomatic relations all have their part to play in the international trade picture, and all give rise to competing goals and methods. As the interview also implies, Congress, with its power over taxation and commerce, has the leading role to play in insuring that the United States retains its traditional preeminence in world trade.

Secretary Stans describes our present weakened position in world markets, saying that "in the broad range of manufactured goods, exporters in other countries have the edge on us." He also notes that our agricultural exports have not increased in recent years. The result, as some studies point out, is that the textile industry alone is threatened with the loss of 100,000 jobs a year from further increases in imported textiles and finished textile goods.

The remedies which the Secretary describes demonstrate clearly how archaic our past trade policy has been, for each of these remedies—preferential credit terms and tax rates for exporters, a value-added tax, adjustment assistance for domestic industries harmed by imports, effective "escape clause" legislation and voluntary import agreements—already forms a part of the bag of tools of other industrialized countries.

Most of these remedies would require congressional action. Together, they would serve to put to rest the rising waves of protectionism which, though stirred up by legitimate grievances, nevertheless threaten the standing of the United States as a trade leader. For some years, Congress has complacently taken our preeminent position for granted and, with a few exceptions, has turned down some choice opportunities to enact fruitful and progressive trade legislation. Now the complacent ones need to formulate for themselves an effective plan of action, lest our national trade policy become caught in the net of quotas, prohibitive tariffs, and trade wars. I believe that the administration has finally given us some responsible guidelines for this plan of action, and I expect our trade policy to become one of our chief matters of concern in the next session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of Secretary Stans' interview.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERVIEW WITH MAURICE H. STANS, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE: IS UNITED STATES BEING SQUEEZED OUT OF WORLD MARKETS?

Q. Mr. Secretary, are you worried about what's happening in U.S. foreign trade?

A. Yes, I am. In the early 1960s, this country was going blithely along with a trade balance in its favor of 5 billion to 6 billion dollars a year—that is, the U.S. sold that much more abroad than it bought.

Now, quite abruptly, that favorable balance has almost disappeared. In 1968, it fell to less than a billion dollars, and there is no present sign that it will be any better this year, or even in 1970.

Q. Is that because sales of U.S. goods abroad are lagging?

A. No, that isn't the real problem. Exports have done fairly well in recent years. They have been increasing at a rate of 8 or 9 per cent a year. But imports have been growing far faster than that. Last year, for instance, they rose by 24 per cent, while our exports rose only 10 per cent.

Q. Does this have an impact on business and jobs in the United States?

A. Yes. Take the textile industry as an example. Some studies I have seen show that if imports of textiles and apparel continue to grow at the present rate there would be a loss of 100,000 jobs a year in this country. That would be serious, particularly because many of these displaced workers would be from the black minority. So we would face not only economic problems but social problems, too.

Q. Why has the gap been narrowing between what we buy from other countries and what we sell to them?

A. There are several reasons:

One, of course, is the inflation we have had in the U.S. the past few years. This has made it more attractive to import goods from countries where wage rates—and thus selling prices—are lower.

For another thing, Americans seem to like the idea of buying imported things. There is a little touch of glamour attached to products made abroad.

Also, other countries have modernized their manufacturing capabilities to the point where they can compete with us rather well in world markets.

Q. But aren't U.S. industries modernizing, too?

A. Yes. We are ahead in technology in some areas, but not significantly ahead in such

products as radios, TV sets, typewriters and some household appliances.

A great many consumer items, and some industrial products—including machine tools—are made as efficiently and as well in other countries as they are here, and often other countries have the advantage of lower wage costs.

There are only a few industries in which our technology is so far ahead of that of other nations that we can still outdistance them in world trade. Those fields include aircraft, computers, some chemical products. But on the broad range of manufactured goods, exporters in other countries have the edge on us, not only because of lower wages but because of tax and credit advantages.

Q. What about farm products—can we still compete on those?

A. Yes, to a great extent—but competition is getting stiffer. Agricultural products make up approximately 20 per cent of U.S. foreign shipments each year. That is certainly important to our farm population in terms of jobs and income. In recent years, the rate of agricultural exports has not been increasing.

Q. Are we losing our over-all position in world markets?

A. Yes, to some extent. It has been a slow downward drift.

Over the past eight years, the U.S. share of world export trade has fallen from a level of 21 per cent of the total to about 19 per cent.

Q. Does this whole trade problem threaten to get out of hand?

A. No, I don't see it getting to the stage of crisis. But we don't want it to get any worse.

In the Department of Commerce, we are taking steps to restore our trade balance, and we hope that over the next four or five years we can rebuild it significantly.

Q. Will that be done by boosting exports—selling more goods abroad—or by asking Americans to cut down on what they buy overseas?

A. By increasing exports. We do not believe that the answer to the trade gap is to hold back on imports of foreign products into this country, except in highly unusual cases where special factors apply.

We must induce more American companies to realize that there is profit to be made by exporting, and that the feared difficulties of language, foreign exchange and differing trade customs are easily surmounted. The Department of Commerce and the State Department are both able to be of real help in guiding our producers into foreign markets.

Q. Do we have to control inflation as a first step?

A. That is vitally important, of course, but it is only one element in the picture. If we can slow down the inflationary spiral, that will automatically help to keep imports in check, because domestic prices will be more competitive. This would also help to widen our range of exports.

But we need to do much, much more than that. For example, this country needs a better means of financing exports. U.S. exporters today are not at all competitive in the financing terms they can offer buyers in other countries—and it is essential that they should be competitive. In our Department, we are spending a lot of time on this problem, working with Henry Kearns, the president of the Export-Import Bank, and with the Federal Reserve Board.

Q. What are other countries doing to help increase their own foreign trade?

A. Among other things, they are providing larger amounts of credit for their exporters for longer periods of time, and often at lower interest rates than are available to exporters in the U.S.

Q. Does this mean that governments of some countries subsidize exports?

A. Yes, in some cases. There is a tendency abroad to hold down interest rates on money that finances exports, regardless of the movement of money rates in their domestic economy.

In the U.S. we don't do that. Export-financing costs here follow the movement of our interest rates, so at a time like the present, when interest rates are the highest in years, U.S. companies that want to sell abroad are at a deep disadvantage.

Q. Should we follow the pattern set by our competitors and subsidize interest rates for American firms that sell things abroad?

A. I think we have to be more competitive with other countries, and if that means subsidizing interest rates, then we should find a way to do it.

Q. Should we also provide tax credits for exporters?

A. That is a matter we are studying. There are several ways in which our Government could help exporters through direct tax credits or tax deductions. Some of these steps could be taken without any new laws; others would require action by Congress. We are not prepared to say yet which might be the most feasible. Before the end of the year, however, we are hoping to find ways in which the tax system can be used to benefit exporters.

HOW BORDER TAXES HURT

Q. Do U.S. exporters run into problems from taxes in foreign countries where they sell goods?

A. Yes. A particular problem is the growth of border taxes abroad—taxes on goods moving into a country. An American company that wants to market its products in a country with a border tax has to pay that levy if it wants to make the sale.

In many European countries, these border taxes are a reflection of value-added taxes, imposed at various stages of the manufacturing process. There are plans now in the Common Market to get those European countries together on a uniform value-added tax on all manufactured goods, at about 15 per cent of the total price of the goods. That tax would apply to citizens of the countries involved. But U.S. exporters who wanted to sell within the Common Market would have to pay the same 15 per cent when their goods entered a member country, even though they already were priced to include our domestic taxes.

The disadvantage faced by an American producer is even more evident in dealing with a third country. A competitor in a country with a 15 per cent border tax receives a refund of that tax from his government on all exports to another country. The American company gets no such refund of the domestic taxes it pays.

All of this is the result of a major difference between tax systems. In the U.S., we collect most of the taxes by direct levies on corporations and individuals. In Europe, a high proportion of revenues is collected on merchandise, and it is these so-called indirect taxes that are reflected in the border-tax rates that are assessed on imports and rebated on exports.

We in the Commerce Department are coming to the conclusion that there should be serious study of a value-added tax in the U.S. as a partial substitute for other types of excises and income taxes.

Q. Have you made such a recommendation?

A. We have not as yet. But we want to study this possibility further with the Treasury Department to be able to make a recommendation, pro or con, at an early date.

OTHER HURDLES FOR THE UNITED STATES

Q. Besides taxes, are there other things that cut the flow of U.S. goods into foreign countries?

A. Yes, besides tariffs there are a great many kinds of nontariff barriers that restrict trade.

Q. What are some of them?

A. One example is the restrictions other countries put on the purchases of products by their government agencies or by nationalized industries. These tend to effectively shut out American goods.

Then, in addition, many countries put difficult technical requirements on imports for the purpose of regulating health or safety. In some cases, foreign governments actually subsidize exports by one means or another. And there are hundreds of other nontariff barriers that impede our exports.

Q. Do we in the U.S. have some of these nontariff barriers, too?

A. Yes, we have some restrictions on imports that are highly criticized by other nations. The "Buy America" law is one. But this Act specifies very clearly the exact measure of disadvantage a foreign company has in selling to the U.S. Government or its agencies. No other country has the equivalent of this law, and in most countries such transactions are foreclosed to American producers by local administrative procedures.

By and large, we do not have anywhere near the trade restrictions that other countries have, and that makes for a lack of reciprocity in our trading relationships.

Q. In your recent travels abroad trying to get trade barriers lifted, what attitudes have you found?

A. Governments of most countries agree that these bars to trade ought to be eliminated, or at least considerably reduced.

On behalf of the U.S., I have proposed what we call an "open-table policy"—a suggestion that we put all the facts about trade barriers and restrictions out in the open and try to find ways to reduce their number and their impact. In almost every case, this proposal has been welcomed, and steps are under way now to set up meetings at which these things can be explored.

Q. What about the Japanese? Are they cooperating?

A. The Japanese Government has not endorsed the principle as wholeheartedly as some other countries. Japan has more than 120 different quantitative restrictions on imports. Those restrictions are in violation of their commitment under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—the so-called GATT agreement.

On the other hand, our own trade difficulties with Japan have been related in large measure to timing. We have been pressing them for some time to cut trade barriers and to make it easier for our people to invest there. They have set up a timetable, but it is much too slow, particularly since our trade balance last year was a negative 1.1 billion dollars, and probably will rise to a negative 1.5 billion this year.

On the positive side, for the long term, I believe the Japanese are slowly coming to the conclusion that their position as a major world power requires them to assume a greater degree of international reciprocity, and thus to modify some of their trade restrictions.

Q. Since a major trade worry now centers on textile imports from Japan, are you proposing some special kinds of voluntary import restraints?

A. Yes. We have proposed that an international agreement be negotiated with key exporting countries as a solution of this problem. Our concern over textile imports involves not only Japan but a number of other countries in the Far East and elsewhere. President Nixon and his Administration recognize it as a unique type of problem that requires a special approach. The situation is this:

For certain kinds of textiles and apparel, mostly from synthetic fibers and wool, the U.S. is the only open market in the world. Every other major nation has put restrictions on imports of those items. As a result, the producing countries all are directing their

output toward the U.S., and are increasing their capacity at an outstanding rate. This has brought a tidal wave of imports that the domestic industry simply hasn't been able to combat. Just on apparel from synthetic fibers, U.S. imports from Japan were up 51 per cent in the first six months of 1969, compared with the same months last year.

Q. Has this posed a critical problem for textile manufacturers here?

A. Yes. The labor organizations are greatly exercised at the loss of employment and the necessity for closing plants in some communities. And producing companies are finding their profit margins shrinking. Wage rates here are several times as high as those of our large overseas competitors.

Q. What can be done about it?

A. We think it can be handled by an orderly system of marketing. We are telling textile producers in Japan and elsewhere: "We do not ask you to reduce the level of your shipments ot the U.S. We are willing to accept the 1968 level and even permit an increase, year by year, as our total market grows. No one in your country need lose a job and no one in the U.S. need be forced out of work."

In other words, we are seeking to hold imports to a moderate rate of growth, rather than permitting the massive increases that have been taking place in the past few years.

Q. Why not work through GATT and get the countries that have put barriers on imports of textiles across their own borders to reduce those barriers, so the U.S. doesn't have to absorb the whole flood?

A. None of the countries we have talked to is willing to do that. They feel that a degree of protection is necessary for their own industries.

Here, obviously, is a perfect example of the unworkability of an absolute free-trade policy. There is no really free-trade country in the world. Every nation has some barriers to trade, over and above tariff walls, to protect what it considers its long-term interests.

So the U.S. has to face the textile problem on that same basis, and find a way to moderate the rate of imports. This unusual situation does not contradict President Nixon's basic belief in a freer trade policy.

Q. Are there other products besides textiles where manufacturers are demanding protection from foreign imports?

A. Yes. Congress has been getting complaints from producers of shoes, steel, electronics, flat glass and other items. In some of these instances, adjustments to the import problem might be made by the industries concerned. But I believe that we need better legislation than now exists to help companies that are clearly harmed by excessive imports.

Q. Isn't there an "escape clause" in existing law that is supposed to help companies that are being hurt?

A. Yes, but that provision is ineffective. The law is so tightly written that no company up to now has been able to qualify for aid.

Q. What changes do you propose?

A. The President should be given more authority to adjust tariffs in such cases, and access to financial and other assistance should be liberalized for a company and its workers who are clearly being harmed by excessive imports.

Q. More and more American companies are setting up plants in other countries to manufacture goods for the foreign market. Doesn't income from those subsidiaries help offset a falling-off in exports from the U.S.?

A. Yes, to a degree—and this source of income will grow increasingly significant as time goes on.

However, many American companies with subsidiaries overseas that were originally created just to supply foreign markets now are finding it profitable to send some of their merchandise back to the United States. In the future, it may be necessary for more U.S. companies, in their own interest, to move into the low-wage areas of the world and produce for the U.S. market. This is a matter of great concern to us, because it means exporting jobs to other countries.

Q. How much has that meant so far in taking jobs away from American workers?

A. There is really no way to document that or quantify it. We are in an expanding economy with high employment, so it is difficult to measure this kind of loss. But, as a result of more and more U.S. companies moving into the low-wage areas of the world, we do know that we are suffering a definite loss of job opportunities—now and for the future.

WHERE EXPORTS WILL GROW

Q. In what fields of U.S. industry do you foresee the greatest growth of exports in days ahead?

A. We have identified 17 categories of American manufacturing in which we see the greatest opportunity for export growth. At the top of this list is commercial aircraft, in which the U.S. has pre-eminence in the world. Next are computers and high-technology components in electronics. Chemicals are high on the list, and there are others, such as nuclear power plants, telecommunications systems, instrumentation and measuring devices, materials-handling equipment, and so on.

Q. What else is our Government doing, in addition to trying to increase exports, to improve our balance of payments with other countries?

A. The Commerce Department has the responsibility in two other areas which directly affect our payments balance. One has to do with travel, the other with investments by U.S. companies overseas.

In the case of travel, the U.S. presently has a "travel gap" of about 2 billion dollars a year. That is the amount that Americans spend in other countries in excess of what people from other countries spend here.

We are pushing an active campaign to induce more people abroad to visit the United States. We are expanding the program this year to induce travel agencies to offer flat-price package and group tours to foreigners to visit the U.S., and we are trying to get business and professional groups from other countries to hold conventions in this country.

In the case of direct control over foreign investments, we recognize that this is not a desirable long-range program. We want to eliminate it. We are continuing it now only because of the current stringency in the balance of payments.

Under present controls, the amount of American investment that will be permitted overseas in 1969 is about 3.35 billion dollars. That is in terms of actual net investment, which will be augmented, of course, by money that can be raised by American companies in foreign markets.

This limit is not a severe impediment to business in the present economic climate. As soon as the balance-of-payments situation permits, the Administration will want to remove the remaining controls on overseas investment.

Q. In the meantime, should measures be taken to restrict American travel abroad?

A. As you know, the Johnson Administration proposed some restrictive measures, and even taxes on spending by U.S. travelers abroad. President Nixon has decided against any proposals of this type.

We would very much like the American people to see their own country first. But, beyond exhortations of that type, we have no plans to make it more difficult for Americans to travel to other countries.

THE INTERNATIONAL EYE FOUNDATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a unique charitable organization, one of the most valuable in the United States, is the International Eye Foundation, with headquarters located in the Sibley Memorial Hospital, Washington, D.C. In the words of its executive director, Mr. James Jay Lawlor, the IEF is dedicated to the promotion of peace and better understanding through the prevention and cure of worldwide blindness. In its work toward this great end the foundation receives no Government funds of any sort, but depends entirely upon the generosity of individuals.

In order that Members of Congress may become newly or better acquainted with the activities of the IEF, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of its history and purpose and its annual report for 1968–69 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL EYE FOUNDATION

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

The International Eye Foundation is the result of an expanded organization of the International Eye-Bank, to provide training in the latest eye diagnostic and surgical techniques for young American and foreign ophthalmologists. In answer to many requests, and as a result of the observations of Doctors Tom Dooley, Peter Commanduras and J. H. King, Jr., the International Eye-Bank was established in 1961 to fulfill an urgent need. Eye tissues were becoming available in the United States for the treatment of the blind who would benefit by eye tissue transplants, but no tissues were available in many other countries. This free service to provide ocular tissue to foreign hospitals and eye surgeons has been successful in the prevention and treatment of blindness in areas where no help was formerly forthcoming. During times of emergencies, such as have occurred recently in the Near East and Viet Nam, special efforts are made to provide corneal tissue for military and civilian casualties of war. The international Eye Foundation recently established an eye-bank for this purpose at the Vinh Long Hospital near Saigon. Twenty-five others have been formed throughout the world.

It became obvious soon after the establishment of the eye-bank that a much broader program was not only necessary, but in demand in practically every area of the free world. Many newly emerging countries do not have the benefit of trained medical and para-medical personnel, especially in the highly specialized fields of eye surgery and eye-banking. As a result, the International Eye Foundation program has been expanded to include fellowships, surgical teaching teams and visiting professor programs throughout the world. One facet of the reorganization has been the formation of a prominent lay board of which former President Dwight D. Eisenhower is the Honorary President.

The International Eye Foundation is dedicated to the promotion of peace and better understanding through the prevention and cure of world-wide blindness. Of the more than 15 million known blind throughout the world, over one-fourth could be cured or helped to a great degree by the services of the International Eye Foundation; thousands have already returned to a useful place in society. This is not a "missionary" program, but is an effort to teach others to become self sufficient in proper eye care and the prevention and treatment of blindness.

The general plan of the International Eye Foundation is to establish eye units in areas, including the United States, where the need for the prevention and treatment of blindness is of paramount importance and where present facilities are inadequate. Most of

these areas are those of low economic status where there are few eye specialists, nurses, technicians and trained administrative personnel. The "People to People" philosophy of assistance initiated by President Eisenhower is followed as closely as possible.

Teaching is the primary aim of the International Eye Foundation, geared to the reduction of blindness by raising the standards of eye care. These programs are primarily to encourage self-help and are designed to phase out after a specified period of time. I.E.F. doctors go only where they are invited.

Assistance is offered in the establishment of local eye-bank facilities, with new preservation methods. In some countries, this is augmented by the presence of eye specialists from the U.S.A. in residence from periods of several months to a year or more. Ophthalmologists in their last year of training, or those who have recently completed training, are assigned for a minimum of three months. These men work in a university eye clinic, in most instances, under the authority of the senior local ophthalmologist. Visiting voluntary senior professors supplement the program by teaching for two to four week assignments.

The young men are sponsored by the International Eye Foundation fellowships for travel plus a small monthly stipend. The host country furnishes housing, local transportation and food (or a food allowance).

Fellowships are assigned to countries that desire to send a young ophthalmologist to the International Eye Foundation in Washington to study eye-banking methods and new techniques in ophthalmology. These individuals are selected by their local ophthalmological societies for a tour of three months. Travel, a small monthly stipend, and in some cases, housing, are provided. These are financed by private fellowship donations to the International Eye Foundation and funds raised through the efforts of the "Foresight" club.

A research program is conducted to discover the causes and treatment of blinding diseases and to upgrade eye-banking technics and processes for the preservation of human ocular tissues. Clinics and conferences are held at the headquarters of the International Eye Foundation and are attended by local and foreign ophthalmologists, fellows and eye residents. A research fellowship is sponsored by the International Eye Foundation on a yearly basis.

In cooperation with the 60 members of the Eye-Bank Association of America, fresh and preserved eye tissues are shipped to hospitals and eye surgeons who cannot obtain them locally. United States and foreign ophthalmologists, technicians, nursing and administrative personnel are offered free courses in eye-banking, preservation, nursing care and administration at the Foundation headquarters in Washington.

The International Eye Foundation structure consists of a Medical Director, Associate Medical Director, Director of Research and Training and Executive Director. The Medical Advisory Board lists many well-known United States ophthalmologists interested in international medicine. The Board of Directors is made up of prominent laymen, interested in the concepts of the International Eye Foundation, who direct its development and recommend measures for fund-raising. Reports are submitted to sponsors of fellowships and other contributors.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1968–69

Fellowships . . .

During the past fiscal year, renewals were received for the Bunker, Hermann and Carrigan Fellowships, and a new fellowship was established in the name of Walter Atkinson, M.D. Program areas and fellows serving included:

1. El Salvador: The Hermann Fellowship provided funds for four young American ophthalmologists from Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri to teach, operate and continue their surgical training at the University Hospital in El Salvador under the direction of Professor Humberto Escapini. Each of the following men served for a period of three months: F. Thomas Ott, M.D., George Bohigian, M.D., Mitchell Shapiro, M.D. and Richard E. Lernor, M.D.

2. Karachi, Pakistan: The McCormick and Bunker Fellowships provided funds for the training of two young ophthalmologists at the Spencer Eye Hospital, Stephen P. Shearing, M.D. of San Francisco and G. David Wiltchik, M.D. of Brooklyn. Doctor Shearing and Doctor Wiltchik each served in Karachi for a period of six months and both participated in an "eye camp" program where hundreds of destitute blind patients were operated upon.

3. Haiti: The Fitzgerald Fellowship at Port de Paix, Haiti, provided training for Fred Slaughter, M.D. of Bristol, Tennessee and G. David Wiltchik, M.D. of Brooklyn, New York. Both men served at the Immaculate Conception Hospital for six months.

4. Puerto Rico: From January to April 1969, the International Eye Foundation, utilizing funds from the Bunker, Hermann, Atkinson and Smith, Miller & Patch Fellowships, granted fellowships for ten Latin American ophthalmologists to study the Basic Sciences of Ophthalmology at the University of Puerto Rico in San Juan, Puerto Rico. This course was formerly sponsored by a grant to the I.E.F. from the Agency for International Development, however, these funds were not available during the past year. As a result, it was necessary for the I.E.F. to provide $10,000 from its fellowship accounts for this purpose. The men who were sponsored, and their countries of origin are as follows:

Dr. Carlos Alberto Antonini Romero, Argentina.
Dr. Oscar Blacutt López, Bolivia.
Dr. Francisco J. Vázquez Gómez, Colombia.
Dr. Ernesto Gómez Sánchez, Dominican Republic.
Dr. José E. Marmolejo Arache, Dominican Republic.
Dra. Esperanza Mungula Salina, Nicaragua.
Dr. Silvio Colman Romero, Paraguay.
Dra. Renée Villaverde Samaniego, Peru.
Dr. Juan H. Berrios Rivera, San Salvador.
Dr. Juan Espinoza Camacho, Venezuela.

Alfredo Levisohn, M.D. was provided a fellowship to assist in the lectures given in the Basic Science Course during February. Doctor Levisohn is a senior resident in ophthalmology at Georgetown and was quite valuable to the course because of his ability to translate lectures into Spanish.

Serving with the International Eye Foundation on a fellowship from the Heed Foundation of Chicago was Ann Irish, M.D., a graduate of the Georgetown University program. Doctor Irish spent the entire year with the I.E.F. It was agreed that following her fellowship, Doctor Irish would remain with the I.E.F. as Director of Research and Training. In order to investigate locations for future Eye Foundation programs, Doctor Irish was requested to make a survey of several eye institutes in India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Egypt and Tunisia. As a result of her trip, it is anticipated that new programs will be established by the I.E.F. in India and Tunisia as soon as the necessary funds are available.

The Carrigan Fellowship provided three month's training at the Foundation headquarters in Washington and at eye centers in New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Duke University and the University of Florida for Roberto Fernandez, M.D. of Argentina. Doctor Fernandez spent six weeks studying eye-banking, corneal preservation methods and cornea transplant surgery at the I.E.F. headquarters, and the rest of his time was devoted to working in the various research projects which are being performed at the above-named centers.

This year, for the first time, a fellowship was granted to a social worker serving the blind. Mr. S. H. Siddiqui of the Spencer Eye Hospital in Karachi, Pakistan was sponsored by the Bunker Fellowship for study at the Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind in Washington, D.C. Mr. Siddiqui spent three months on case work in Washington, D.C. and had one month's training at the Lighthouse in New York City.

Juan Berrios, M.D. of El Salvador was provided a partial Hermann Fellowship to supplement his training at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri.

The Bunker Fellowship provided funds for the purchase of a Jenkel-Davidson Clini-Camera to be used in the Corneal Clinic at the Sibley-Georgetown Corneal Center for close-up ocular photography. The Hermann Fellowship and a grant from Ethicon, Inc., provided new eye instruments and sutures for use in the I.E.F. programs in El Salvador and Haiti. Photographic equipment to assist in the training of fellows at the Foundation headquarters was purchased with funds from the Atkinson and Carrigan Fellowships and several new eye texts for the I.E.F. library were provided through the Bunker and Hermann Fellowships.

Mr. Grover Hermann and Mr. George M. Bunker, long-time sponsors of fellowships for the I.E.F., were both honored by the Pan American Association of Ophthalmology for their efforts to provide better care and treatment for the blind throughout the world.

Tissue shipments

During the past year, there was a marked shortage of eye tissue available for cornea transplant surgery in the United States. For this reason, it was possible for the International Eye Bank to send only 25 pairs of eyes for penetrating cornea grafts to foreign hospitals and surgeons. However, 316 preserved corneas, 42 preserved sclera and 18 specimens of vitreous were shipped. Corneas and scleral tissue were provided to the Vinh Long Hospital in Viet Nam for the treatment of both civilian and military casualties of the Vietnamese war. Other supplies and equipment were provided for the eye-bank there which was established under I.E.F. auspices in 1966. Supplies and equipment were also donated by the I.E.F. to help establish eye-banks in Quito, Equador; Buenos Aires, Argentina and Bilaspur, India.

A new eye shipping container was developed by the I.E.F. which maintains the proper temperature for shipment of eye tissue for 72 hours. The container was thoroughly tested, both in the laboratory and in the field, and has proven completely satisfactory for eye shipments to any part of the world. This multi-use container is inexpensive enough to be considered disposable for overseas use. It is felt that most eye-banks will begin using this "eye shipper" regularly in the near future.

A detailed report of the activities of the International Eye-Bank since its inception in 1961 is attached.

Surgical teaching teams

A team consisting of A. B. Rizzuti, M.D. of Brooklyn, New York; Anthony Della Rocca, M.D., White Plains, New York and Trimble Johnson, M.D., Atlanta, Georgia, traveled extensively through the Far East teaching and operating under the auspices of the I.E.F. in February and March. Areas in which the team operated were Karachi, Pakistan; Djakarta, Indonesia; Denpasar, Bali and Singapore. These surgeons were also honored guest lecturers at eye conferences being held in Djakarta and Singapore. An eye-bank to serve the South Pacific was established at this time in Singapore, with the support of the I.E.F.

Corneal conference

The First annual Corneal Conference sponsored by the I.E.F. Corneal Center was held at the Foundation headquarters, Sibley Memorial Hospital, Washington, D.C., on April 9 and 10, 1969. The conference was attended by 45 ophthalmologists and eye residents from the Washington area. Among the eleven well-known guest lecturers were two outstanding South American professors, Enrique Malbran, M.D. and Juan Arentsen Sauer, M.D. The Chairman of the Conference was John Harry King, Jr., M.D., Medical Director of the Foundation. Also attending the lectures, at no fee, were a number of ophthalmic nurses, technicians and operating room assistants from the Washington area.

Corneal center

The Corneal Center, co-founded in 1968, by the International Eye Foundation, Sibley Memorial Hospital and Georgetown University was responsible for examination and treatment of 62 patients under the direction of A. M. Reynolds, Jr., M.D., Chairman of the Department of Ophthalmology at Sibley Memorial Hospital, J. H. King, Jr., M.D. and Ann Irish, M.D.

Research

The International Eye Foundation research program involving the use of collagen was initiated at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Washington. Doctor Ann Irish is devoting one-half of her time to the work which was begun by Doctor King in 1964. A small research grant has been made available by the Veterans' Administration to help support this important project. Additional funds have been applied for in order to expand the research program during the coming year.

Tissue distribution center

Plans for an eye-bank teletype network have been formulated by the I.E.F. which would provide instant communication between ten major regional members of the Eye-Bank Association of America. The network would greatly increase the efficiency of communications regarding available tissue, emergency needs and methods of shipment of tissue throughout the United States. The system would be valuable for not only the distribution of eye tissue, but also other human tissue used for transplantation, including heart, kidney, blood vessels and inner ear. An application to provide funds for a pilot study for the "Tissue Distribution Center" was submitted to the National Institutes of Health, however, the application was rejected and funds are still being sought for this most important project.

Eye test charts provided free

An eye test chart developed by the Prevention of Blindness Society, Washington, D.C. was sent by mail from the International Eye Foundation to over 35,000 families throughout the country during the spring of 1969. The test charts are designed to indicate eye problems such as amblyopia in young children. Early diagnosis of such problems can quite often save the eyesight of a child. The chart is designed to be used by the mother in the home with the recommendation that if problems are indicated, the child should be taken to an ophthalmologist for further examination. The I.E.F. brochure and a donation request were included in the mailing. A grateful response was received by the Foundation for this service, which will be continued on a larger scale when funds are available.

Eye dance

The 1969 Eye Dance was held at the home of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Bunker of Spring Valley, Washington, D.C. Due to the sudden illness of President Salazar of Portugal, the dance was relocated at the last moment from the Embassy of Portugal to the Bunker home. Thanks to the superlative effort put forth by the Ladies Committee, a profit of $4,500 was received to help support the I.E.F. programs.

Christmas cards

A profit of over $700 was realized from the sale of Christmas cards in 1968. The Foundation will have cards available for sale each year as a result of the success of past efforts.

Black tie dance benefit

A benefit dance for the I.E.F. was held in May of 1969 at Marwood, the Gore estate, in Potomac, Maryland. The dance was sponsored by the Black Tie Club of Washington and was highly successful. As a result of the dance, the Black Tie Club presented $5,000 to the I.E.F.

Foresight luncheon

A Ladies Committee, chaired by Mrs. John F. Kramer and Mrs. William D. Clark, both of Bethesda, was formed in April to sponsor the first annual Foresight Luncheon and Fashion Show for the benefit of the I.E.F. The luncheon will be held on September 10, 1969, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C. The ladies hope to sell 900 tickets for the luncheon to raise a minimum of $5,000 for the support of the Eye Foundation programs. Miss Anita Colby, a prominent member of the I.E.F. Board of Directors and well-known fashion consultant, has agreed to serve as Mistress of Ceremonies. Tickets are available through the I.E.F. headquarters at Sibley Memorial Hospital.

Public service announcements

The Eye Foundation owes a debt of gratitude to Miss Anita Colby and Miss Barbara Walters of New York City and Mr. Al Ross of Washington for their generous cooperation in producing radio announcements for the Foundation. These announcements were sent to 300 radio stations throughout the country during the past year and, as a result, many letters of inquiry and offers of support were received. The announcements are played free of charge by the radio stations on public service air time.

A T.V. announcement is being planned, and a script has been sent to Mr. Bob Hope with the request that he donate his services for this one-minute announcement.

A documentary film is also being planned with production to begin as soon as funds are received for financing. The total amount needed for the documentary is $40,000.

AID accreditation

At the request of the Accreditations Committee of the Agency for International Development, three members of the Foundation appeared before their April hearing. Mrs. Florence S. Mahoney; Doctor King, Medical Director, and Mrs. James J. Lawlor, Executive Director of the I.E.F. testified regarding the Foundation's programs in order to have the I.E.F. recognized as an accredited voluntary agency providing medical services abroad. One of the prerequisites of the Committee was that the Foundation be incorporated. This was accomplished in the District of Columbia on May 25, 1969. Accreditation was received early in July.

New York office

The Foundation has rented space in New York City at 135 East 54th Street for an office and department which will be used by the New York Fund Raising Committee and I.E.F. staff, and also to house I.E.F. fellows who are sent to New York to study at various eye institutes as part of their fellowship program.

New quarters

Additional space has been provided to the Foundation on the sixth floor of Hayes Hall at Sibley Memorial Hospital. Approximately three times as much floor space as our old unit has been renovated for both administrative offices and laboratory area. This has been provided at no additional charge by the administrators of Sibley Hospital, and plans are currently under way to provide space for research animals in the animal quarters at the main hospital building. This will allow the Foundation to increase its research activities and relocate some of the programs which are being carried out at other institutions.

New board members

During 1969, the following new members were added to the International Eye Foundation Board of Directors:

Mr. John H. Meier, Hughes Nevada Organization, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Mr. James F. Ryan, Georgetown Research and Development Corporation, Washington, D.C.

DRUGS FROM THE SEA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in its comprehensive report to the President and Congress earlier this year, entitled "Our Nation and the Sea," the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources called attention to the need for exploration for new food and drug resources from the oceans.

Last month, a conference to discuss this particular subject was held at the University of Rhode Island. Its sponsors were the Marine Biology Committee of the Marine Technology Society, Earl Herron, Jr., chairman; the College of Pharmacy, University of Rhode Island; and the Bio-Instrumentation Advisory Council of the American Institute of Biological Sciences.

Out of this conference came strong endorsement of S. 1588, introduced by the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) and cosponsored by the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) and myself. The bill would establish a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology in the National Institutes of Health.

The endorsement is gratifying because it underscores the need for enactment of the legislation and emphasizes the findings of the Marine Science Commission, when it stated:

> Practically no research is presently being conducted by government or industry on marine bioactive substances as possible sources of new commercial pharmaceutical products. . . . So far, less than one per cent of all the sea organisms known to contain biologically active materials have been studied.

The Commission, therefore, specifically recommended the establishment of a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology "to effect a methodical evaluation of the sea as a source of new and useful active substances."

It is gratifying, also, that a general publication like Time magazine has devoted a full page of text and illustration to the subject of "Drugs From the Sea." I ask unanimous consent that the Time article of September 5, 1969, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

My State of Hawaii has a keen interest in marine medicine. The University of Hawaii has pioneered in various aspects of research of the sea and its products with a view toward advancing scientific knowledge which can be applied toward the causes, diagnosis, prevention, treatment, and control of physical and mental diseases and impairments of man.

Several groups of investigators at the

University of Hawaii are studying various marine biomedical products in the seas about Hawaii and in the tropical Indo-Pacific.

I have been advised that the many biomedical scientists at the University of Hawaii view with great satisfaction the proposed legislation to establish the National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology, as the institute has objectives which are consistent with those endorsed by the Hawaii State Legislature in setting up the Pacific Biomedical Research Center in 1962.

It was recognized then that the University of Hawaii could most usefully capitalize on the adjacent marine environment for undertaking studies of organisms which are of direct medical usefulness to man in that they yield drugs, and also that many marine organisms provide simple models of the more complex systems operating in man and the higher vertebrates.

In this context, for example, it is recalled that the whole range of disorders known as cancer involve the rapid and uncontrolled division and replication of cells. Some of the most sophisticated studies of cell division in the world are taking place now in the Pacific Biomedical Research Center where a group of investigators are using the sea urchin egg as their experimental tool; the sea urchins are collected right off shore from the Waikiki laboratory.

In addition to the work at the Pacific Biomedical Research Center, the Hawaii Institute of Biology at the University of Hawaii has been investigating marine toxins, especially of fishes, in a continuing program over the last decade.

The major research effort in the poisonous fish program has centered on ciguatera, the most common and widespread form of blood poisoning from eating fish. It is found in tropical regions throughout the world and involves a great many species of reef fishes.

More than 28 scientific publications have resulted from the poisonous fish investigations of the University of Hawaii.

Another group of investigators, in the school of medicine, is systematically searching for various pharmacological agents in the Pacific and Asian tropics, several of which come from the tropical seas.

A professor in the department of botany is studying chemical products of biological activity produced by Philippine algae, while several in the department of microbiology are devoting part of their search efforts to the study of products and activity of various algae, fungi, and bacteria.

In the department of chemistry, several faculty members are working on the elucidation of the molecular structure of marine biological products.

As an institution oriented toward the biologically rich tropical sea, the University of Hawaii has a deep interest in the progress of S. 1588, now pendng in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. If S. 1588 is enacted and funded, the University of Hawaii would be in a position to move to the forefront of institutional research in marine medicine and pharmacology.

I am confident that other universities, in their own marine setting, would advance also if given the impetus possible with the establishment of the proposed National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology.

For the sake of the health and well-being of people everywhere who would benefit from marine medicine and pharmacology, I urge that S. 1588 be given early and favorable consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRUGS FROM THE SEA

Researchers will go anywhere and test anything in the hope of finding medicines to use against diseases and disorders that by present methods are either difficult to treat or incurable. One of their most fortuitous finds was made in a Peoria (Ill.) market, where they scraped from an overripe cantaloupe the parent strain of mold that fathered millions of doses of penicillin. Now that most of the world's land surface has been fine-combed for microbes that might yield new antibiotics, the scientists are turning to the sea. One useful drug, cephalothin (which is effective against many germs that are resistant to penicillin), has already been developed from a mold that was recovered near a sewer outlet in the sea off Sardinia. The search, recently intensified, extends from the Sea of Japan to the frigid waters of Antarctica, from the tepid shallows of coral reefs in the Caribbean to the far-western Pacific.

Last week 202 specialists in half a dozen sciences met at the University of Rhode Island for a roundup conference on the progress and problems connected with mining the seas for drugs. Almost to a man, they complained of lack of funds—a shortage intensified by recent cutbacks in governmental grants—and proclaimed their support of Senator Warren Magnuson's bill to set up a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology. In speech after speech they pointed out that the vast majority of all known forms of animal life are found in the sea, which they expect to yield a proportionately rich harvest of medically useful chemicals. Dr. Paul R. Burkholder, famed for his discovery of chloramphenicol[1] (in a Venezuelan soil mold) more than 20 years ago, prodded the pharmaceutical industry to speed up its testing of sea-spawned compounds that show antibiotic promise, a number of which he himself has isolated.

Esoteric Substances. In fact, six drug companies were represented at the Rhode Island conference. Some are already active in the field, testing such esoteric substances as paolin I, an antibacterial compound, and paolin II, an antiviral agent. Both were extracted from the juices of the abalone by Dr. Chen Pien Li at the National Institutes of Health. Similar extracts from quahaugs (thick-shelled clams) have been found to be active against some forms of cancer in mice. So far, chemicals from shellfish appear to have only moderate potency, but the sea offers an almost infinite variety of other potential sources, such as algae, corals and sponges, and the bacteria that live in or on them.

Marine pharmacologists have extracted alginic acid from algae and seaweeds, and have made salts (alginates) with a wide variety of medicinal properties. Some help tablets to disintegrate more rapidly in the stomach. Others form the basis of anti-clotting drugs and of preparations to control surface bleeding. Sodium alginate has the exciting ability to reduce man's absorption of radioactive strontium by about 90%.

The most biologically potent chemicals so far extracted from marine life are the poisons that primitive creatures use for self-protection. That does not discourage the sea-going biologists. After all, they point out, the vegetable poison curare has proved invaluable as a muscle relaxant that is used with general anesthesia for surgery. The Japanese are already using molecular modifications of marine venoms as medicines.

Paul Burkholder, 66, who is now at the University of Puerto Rico and works in a laboratory at Mayagüez, also serves as senior marine scientist for Lederle Laboratories. Some of his antibacterial finds have come from sponges collected from as far away as Australia's Great Barrier Reef and Palau in the Caroline Islands. When he arrived in Rhode Island last week, he had scarcely dried off from a scuba-diving, sponge-hunting expedition on the outermost edge of the Caribbean, between the British islands of Virgin Gorda and Anegada. Burkholder made his dives with an assistant, Robert Brody, who is completing his doctoral work on the gorgonians, or "soft corals." Together they snipped off specimens of the most familiar gorgonian, the purplish fan coral, and a variety of sponges (of which about 5,000 species are known).

Semisynthesis. In the boat from which they worked, Dr. John Webb put the specimens into jars filled with alcohol. Ashore, within a few hours, some were quick-frozen, others were dried, and all were flown to Lederle's labs at Pearl River, N.Y. There the tedious and time-consuming process of searching for medicinally useful compounds began with the preparation of crude extracts. It will continue through a variety of screening tests that will determine whether the extract is active against such familiar microbes as the staphylococcus and other causes of human disease.

If an extract proves to be active, the next stage of testing will be more difficult: isolating the individual ingredient responsible for the activity. Even more difficult is the task of determining the chemical identity of the isolated substance. Once that is done, it must be tested in animals to find out whether its germ-killing powers outweigh whatever undesirable side effects it may have. If the compound proves both safe and effective enough to be tested in man, the laboratory chemists will face the task of either synthesizing it or using the natural product as the base for a semisynthetic drug, the technique that is used in producing cephalothin.

In the search for drugs from the sea, from five to seven years may well elapse from the underwater snipping of a sponge specimen to the marketing of an antibiotic. But the seafaring scientists are confident that eventually the seas will yield a whole new pharmacopoeia of valuable drugs.

[1] The most effective drug against typhoid fever, psittacosis and Rocky Mountain spotted fever, but commonly misused for minor infections.

PROJECT SANGUINE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Navy is at present involved in developing in northern Wisconsin a massive communications system called Sanguine. This multibillion-dollar project will eventually dig up miles of Wisconsin farm and forest land to bury thousands of miles of wire.

My eminent colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) has been expressing grave concern about the project which is now in a testing phase in our State. With some $50 million appropriated for initial work, Senator NELSON fears that the electrical currents given off by the grid could cause irreparable damage to the

natural ecology of the north country. He is also concerned that the electrical currents could be a threat to human safety.

On August 31, the Washington Evening Star published an excellent article entitled "Pentagon at War in Wisconsin," written by Roberta Hornig.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENTAGON AT WAR IN WISCONSIN

(By Roberta Hornig)

A "secret" Pentagon project called Sanguine is sparking a new kind of warfare in Wisconsin.

Project Sanguine calls ultimately for a massive underground electrical field covering parts of 26 counties in northern Wisconsin. The grid system would then serve as the military communications network for the United States.

But almost everyone, including the Pentagon, is worried that Project Sanguine will harm northern Wisconsin's natural environment.

And at a time of increasing concern over man's plundering of his environment, a state committee has been formed to try to halt the project.

The critics say they are worried because:

The massive electrical field could be harmful to living creatures in the area, upsetting fertility and natural cycles. Long-term effects could be fatal.

Any metallic object in the area would be electrified, unless first grounded or insulated.

The state's telephone system could be adversely affected.

Plant life within the area—which is mostly scenic woodlands—could be hurt.

The Pentagon is spending $1.6 million just to investigate those problems, and to soothe public fears in the state.

Sources say Project Sanguine eventually will cost more than $1 billion. Thus far, Congress has appropriated between $25 million and $50 million for initial work.

The Navy is coordinating construction, and a Navy spokesman says:

"Sanguine is big. It would give worldwide coverage for a single transmitter complex in the United States." No relays will be necessary, the Navy said, and no nuclear attack could knock it out.

Why Wisconsin? That state was chosen because it has "good bedrock, is an area with low conductivity and has insignificant faults" that are not likely to cause earthquakes.

Although the Navy is willing to talk about Sanguine, to tell what the goal is and all the things, the military is doing to make certain it won't hurt the environment of northern Wisconsin, the most specific information about it is coming from the Wisconsinites fighting it.

Democratic Sen. Gaylord Nelson and Prof. Ken Shifford of Northland College, who heads the "State Committee to Stop Sanguine," report that the huge military communications antenna will be made up of approximately 6,000 miles of underground, high voltage wire.

TO BE 240 SITES

In addition to the miles of cable, requiring 30-foot rights-of-way, they say, there will be 240 transmitter sites each requiring 10 fenced-off acres.

Presumably the information is coming from briefings the military is conducting both in Washington and in Wisconsin for the state's congressional delegation, governor, heads of state agencies and worried property owners.

Shifford, who teaches European history, and others putting together a statewide anti-Sanguine organization will hold a meeting at Stevens Point on September 21.

"I'm against it for a half-dozen categories of reasons," Shifford said yesterday in a telephone interview.

His big concern—and the Navy apparently agrees to this—is that no one knows what the ultimate environmental effects will be.

"At any time," Shifford said, "an electrical field could be harmful to any living creature in it.

"It could affect fertility . . . then there's fish and earthworms."

Shifford said that even simple shocks can drive earthworms from the ground. "An earthworm is an essential link in the chain of nature," he said, suggesting the electrical shock therefore could upset all plant life in the area.

"We don't know what this will do to the deer and the ducks and the geese. It could possibly cause a change in flyways—the flying patterns of waterfowl," he said.

TO CONVINCE THE NAVY

Shifford, who owns 60 acres of land around Ashland, said the group he has formed is against Sanguine "because we think it's bad for the ecology, the economy and the people. We hope to convince the Navy of these three points."

The committee has about 100 workers and, he said, is attracting people "from all political persuasions from all walks of life."

Sanguine involves electrical current in all metallic objects, meaning for example, that wire fences will carry voltage, Shifford said.

"Every doorknob, every fenceline will be electrified. The Navy calls it a 'mild electric shock'.

"I just don't want to live in a mild electric shock area."

QUOTES NAVY

Senator Nelson said that in his briefing, the Navy admitted that powerful currents will be running through the ground but argued that the problem can be "mitigated" by a massive insulating process.

"The Navy actually plans to insulate every strand of wire fence, metal guardrail, railroad track and any other type of running strip of metal that runs near the communications wire," Nelson said.

For example, Nelson said, the Navy predicts that 1,000 feet of wire, 100 feet from an underground wire, will carry 52 volts. At two miles from an underground wire, the same fence would carry 22 volts, he said.

He added that the normal voltage in an electrified cow fence is 12 volts and "a cow fence has been known to be extremely dangerous to small children or to persons with bad hearts, especially on wet days."

Nelson said that the Navy has been sending representatives to northern Wisconsin cities and towns telling concerned citizens that the voltage will be no problem because each fence will be cut at varying intervals, determined by a computer, and insulators will be installed.

"It seems unbelievable when one considers the problems a farmer will have to go through to put in new fencing or change a fence line," Nelson said.

THE DANGER

"The most frightening thing, however, is what happens in the case of old, abandoned fence lines the Navy hasn't found because they are rusting away and half buried in the forests. The chance of a hunter or a small child on a rainy day touching one of these unmitigated lines could bring a real tragedy," Nelson added.

One of these things the Navy is doing to mitigate the fears of the Wisconsonites is to spend $150,000 on tests both in the field and in the lab by the Hazleton Laboratories of Falls Church, Va.

Shifford and others say they would feel more comfortable about the tests, which are just beginning, if the Navy had picked a laboratory it had not worked with before.

They are citing language from Hazleton's research proposal, made before it won the contract last spring.

At one point the research lab reported:

"The antenna will be enormous, and therefore, many people, domestic and farm animals, fish, insects, earthworms, birds and indigenous plant life will be exposed to its field for very long periods of time, unless they are killed by it, are removed, or in the case of free ranging animals, are driven out by noxious effects."

At another point the research proposal said:

"The potential hazard from temperature increases associated with antenna elements, after power is on, will similarly be investigated only to a limited extent using plants.

"It is our opinion that such animals as groundhogs are not of sufficient economic value to be of concern."

In its testing, mostly at the Falls Church lab, Hazleton plans mostly to use cows, bulls, geese, and then, "smaller animals," presumably mice or rats.

The Navy also is having tests conducted out in the field.

THE BEGINNING

The testing is one of the ways Wisconsin citizens found out something was up. They became curious when one day, in the middle of the resort woods, teams of servicemen began building fences and a laboratory.

The test contracts, besides Hazleton's, that have gone out include:

$500,000 to the Radio Corporation of America to study fences and railroads, presumably to assure that no one gets electrocuted.

$400,000 to the Illinois Technical Research Institute "to pull together" and oversee the "mitigation on interference" program.

$200,000 to the Bell Telephone Company Laboratory, to assure no interference with telephone calls. The Wisconsin Public Utilities Commission has been promised that instead of hurting the state's telephone system, Sanguine will upgrade it.

$100,000 to the Battelle Institute, which is a part of Ohio State University, to make certain that underground pipelines won't corrode.

$250,000 to the Great Lakes Shore Electronics Activity, for a "mitigation" study.

AIRPLANES, TOO

The Navy also is conducting studies to make certain that the hot lines won't interfere with the equipment of any airplanes flying overhead.

It is also promised that as part of its "mitigation" program, it will "break long metal things (such as railroad tracks) and insulate every 1,000 feet."

The military also says it has several project "watchdogs," including the President's Science Advisory Council, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Public Health Service and a governmental advisory council on electro-magnetic radiation.

At present, Sanguine is small, consisting of a 28-mile grid system in the form of a cross—to see what happens when the electricity goes on—and a transmitter building with an "interference mitigation" laboratory.

The Navy insists the voltage it plans to use will be quite small—some 64 volts per meter, or, if very near the transmission line, about 100,000 volts per meter. And it promises to use the electricity at "extremely low frequency."

Currently, for testing purposes, Sanguine looks like a bunch of fenced-in telephone lines. These will go underground if the project wins final approval.

Navy spokesmen also insist that testing is just beginning and that there is no design for a Sanguine system at this time. It's at

least a couple of years away from reality, they say.

The project's environmental effects "are an honest question at DOD," a Navy spokesman said.

There will be at least one year of testing, and that proves the military's good intentions, he said. And, he added, the government understands that "the mood of the country now is the environment."

THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION—UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a distinguished former Governor of Indiana, the Honorable Matthew E. Welsh, has been serving since 1965 as chairman of the U.S. section of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada. The work of this significant body is not so widely known as it should be. To remedy that deficiency, Chairman Welsh wrote an unusually interesting article describing its structure and activities for the Department of State Bulletin. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION

(By Matthew E. Welsh)

The five Great Lakes form a chain of inland seas whose vast size staggered the early explorers. They could not believe these were lakes. They kept testing for salt water, thinking surely the chain would lead them to Asia.

These lakes are truly one of the wonders of the world and are a precious asset to the United States and to Canada. Over 60 percent of Canada's population and economy, as well as some 15 percent of ours, is concentrated around the rim of the Great Lakes and in the St. Lawrence Basin. The area presently supports over 40 million people, and a population of 60 million is projected for the year 2000.

Not only are the Great Lakes the busiest waters in the world, but they constitute almost one-third of the earth's total supply of fresh surface water. And four of them are boundary waters.

For some reason, these sea-sized waters have been so taken for granted that their importance and their beauty have been barely comprehended. This attitude appears to be changing, however, because of the dangers to the lakes which have now become apparent to even the most indifferent. As a result, there is considerable interest in the agency which has been given wide-ranging responsibilities with respect to these and other boundary waters—the International Joint Commission—and in the methods used by this unique international institution.

The Commission was formed to carry out the purposes of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909,[1] which are: ". . . to prevent disputes regarding the use of boundary waters and to settle all questions which are now pending between the United States and the Dominion of Canada involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either . . . along their common frontier, and to make provision for the adjustment and settlement of all such questions as may hereafter arise."

The Commission consists of six members, three from each country. The United States Commissioners are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the President. The Canadian Commissioners are appointed by Order in Council of the Canadian Government and serve at the pleasure of the Government.

[1] 36 Stat. 2448.

The treaty gives the IJC responsibilities in two general categories.

The first of these responsibilities is to approve or disapprove all proposals for use, obstruction, or diversion of boundary waters on either side of the boundary which would affect the natural level or flow of the boundary waters on the other side. Examples in the Great Lakes system include the regulating works at Sault Ste. Marie and those on the St. Lawrence, as well as the numerous small dams constructed by water, timber, and paper companies that might affect the natural state of the boundary waters. These projects are brought before the IJC by what are termed "applications," filed by interested persons—either public agencies or private corporations or individuals.

The second general responsibility of the IJC—which is becoming the major work of the Commission—is to investigate and make recommendations on specific problems referred to it by either or both Governments. It is under this provision of the treaty that requests—or "references"—by the two Governments have been made on such varied subjects as water pollution, air pollution, regulation of the levels of the Great Lakes, and preservation of the American Falls at Niagara.

HANDLING OF APPLICATIONS AND REFERENCES

In the case of an application for Commission approval, the burden is on the applicant to furnish all necessary information and data required. Interested persons may intervene in support of or in opposition to the application. This is followed by public hearings, usually on both sides of the boundary, after which the Commission hands down its order concerning the project, which is final.

In the case of references, the procedure is somewhat different. The Commission appoints an international technical board which is directed to make a thorough investigation of the facts involved and file written report with the Commission. The IJC then publishes the board report and schedules full-dress public hearings, normally one in each country in the areas affected, at which any person, *even the humblest*, is given an opportunity to comment on the board's finding and recommendations. The Commission then prepares its report to the two Governments.

I emphasize "even the humblest," for I believe these hearings have been invaluable as a sounding board and safety valve. We are continuously reminded that just because the experts agree on a program it is not automatically acceptable to the public.

Any controversy involving water has a high emotional content. One of the principal reasons for the creation of the Commission was to establish a permanent institution to deal with these problems, an institution that would be free of local or sectional prejudice and would be able to act more expeditiously on matters arising along the boundary than was—or is—possible through usual procedures. On controversial subjects every government tends to move slowly at best, and when the complicating factor of the many interests of another sovereign power is thrown in, movement can become very slow indeed. It was hoped that the IJC could provide a mechanism which would permit prompt as well as equitable resolution of these matters of common concern to both Governments before they festered into serious disagreement.

I believe the IJC has lived up to this expectation. The matters brought to it have been resolved, and resolved, I am sure, with much more dispatch than would have been possible otherwise. It is true that some matters have taken many years from inception to final report to the Governments, but this was because the problem itself could not be quickly or easily solved.

When circumstances require, the IJC moves with dispatch. One recent application, for instance, was acted upon only 17 days after it was received by the Commission; and this included a board investigation and report, two hearings, and the preparation and issuance of an order of approval. In this situation prompt action was necessary if the seasonal spring waters were to be maintained at higher than normal levels for availability during a period of exceptional drought anticipated in the summer and fall. While this speed was unusual, it does sharply point up the flexibility which the IJC has achieved in its procedures.

A TRADITION OF IMPARTIALITY

Another reason for establishing the Commission was to lift questions involving boundary waters out of the hands of a series of temporary bodies charged with resolving only one particular problem or controversy. A permanent commission, with equal representation from each country would, it was hoped, develop a tradition of impartiality and a body of precedent, which would encourage the use of reason in resolving what might otherwise easily become very difficult international disputes.

Here, too, I believe the record is little short of remarkable. Since the formation of the IJC, the Commissioners have divided along national lines or failed to reach unanimous agreement in only three decisions! Of course this search for a common ground, for agreement, has not been easy and frequently has taken much time. Discussions in executive sessions of the Commission are open, frank, and spirited as well as deliberate. The important fact, however, is that a decision *is* reached, but only after thorough and careful investigation, public hearings in both countries, and careful deliberation by a permanent body interested in principles rather than short-term expediency.

When the Commission is charged with a mission by the Governments, just how does it go about this business of determining the facts? In every case the problem area is, by definition, intersected by an international boundary; and within each country there are numerous overlapping jurisdictions, Federal, Provincial, and State, each of which in turn has an interest, frequently one which is very jealously defended. The energies and talents of all these agencies must be harnessed so that they are all working together toward an agreed solution rather than at cross purposes, since it is not possible to regulate only one side of a river or control pollution of only part of a lake. Unless there is general agreement by all concerned, the mere obtaining of accurate and complete data for an entire river basin, for example, would be very difficult, and the attainment of a solution even more so.

INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL BOARDS

The IJC achieves this coordination by creation of an international technical board to assist it with each of its dockets. As a matter of policy, an effort is made to see that each board contains so far as is practicable a member from the agencies in each country which have the primary administrative responsibilities for the matter involved. This board, then, becomes an official forum where information and ideas may be freely exchanged by those most knowledgeable about the problem, with the full sanction of both Governments, having the end in view of developing a technical report which all of them will support. The members of each board are charged by the IJC to act as professional experts rather than as representatives of the point of view of their respective agencies, and in the discussion of their frequent progress reports to the Commission this aspect of their mission is emphasized.

As a result, the IJC provides a vehicle which encourages frank and constructive discussion on a continuing basis between the best technical experts in both countries who have been charged by their governments—Federal, State, and Provincial—with administrative responsibility for the particular

matter at issue. Appointment to an IJC international board is regarded as a mark of professional recognition, and the record of accomplishment of the IJC rests to a considerable extent upon the very high level of competence and dedication of those who provide the technical expertise and data upon which the Commission bases its decisions.

Another result of this procedure is that the IJC has remained a very small agency, not having found it necessary to build a large technical staff of its own. By drawing on experts from existing agencies in both countries and releasing them when the job is finished, the Commission avoids the rigidities that frequently accompany a large permanent organization.

When the Commission approves an application for works, it usually appoints an international board of control to insure compliance with the conditions specified in the order of approval. Similarly, when reporting to the Governments on completion of its investigation following a reference, it may recommend a course of action that will require continuing supervision on an international basis to insure satisfactory results. In such cases the two Governments may authorize appointment of an advisory board to establish and maintain such surveillance under the direction of the Commission. This follow-through procedure has been used successfully in connection with regulation of water levels—where international boards of control answerable to the IJC were created, such as the Kootenay Lake, Niagara River, and St. Lawrence River Boards—and with pollution references, where the advisory boards watch over the progess being made in pollution control and inform the Commission.

An additional device or technique has recently been developed by the IJC in discharge of its growing responsibilites in the field of transboundary water and air pollution, namely, the calling of public international meetings to inquire into the progress being made. The first such meeting was held last January with regard to pollution of the Niagara River. It was felt to be quite successful in bolstering the efforts of the local agencies concerned with the problem, and this procedure will see further use in the future.

The role of the IJC appears to be changing. It its first 20 years it docketed 23 applications and 8 references. From 1933 through 1952 it received 23 applications and 14 references. In the last 15 years, however, it has received more references than applications, 11 versus 9.

While the number of new dockets of the Commission is small, the scope and magnitude of each of the more recent tasks referred to it by the two Governments can only be described as enormous. Regulation of the levels of the entire Great Lake system, investigation into causes of and means of control of pollution of Lakes Erie and Ontario, and investigation of air pollution along the entire boundary are examples. Well over 1,000 engineers, scientists, and specialists and their supporting personnel, all drawn from the public service of both countries, are involved in studies of the Great Lakes under supervision of the IJC on these three references alone.

In addition, over the years a total of 27 boards of control and advisory boards answering to the Commission have been created.

Thus, the Governments are increasingly making use of the IJC to investigate and make recommendations concerning problems of mutual concern along the boundary and entrusting it with the responsibility of supervising efforts at solution. The Commission looks forward to a busy and challenging future.

NEEDED CHANGES IN EVALUATION OF WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the neglect of our precious water resources has become a national shame and disgrace. Erosion, flooding, siltation, and, more recently, pollution are taking a staggering annual toll which cannot be accurately calculated.

Though Congress has given much attention to these problems over the years and private organizations have performed yeoman service in promoting corrective measures, much remains to be done.

One private organization which has long been in the forefront of water resource development is the Mississippi Valley Association. Mr. Grant Barcus, of Kansas City, Kans., who is presently serving as president of MVA, presented a statement to the Water Resources Council on September 9, 1969, setting forth the views of his organization concerning the role of the Bureau of the Budget in evaluating water resource projects. I commend the statement of Mr. Barcus to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 1969, PRESENTED BY GRANT BARCUS, PRESIDENT

My name is Grant Barcus. I am president of L. G. Barcus and Sons, Inc., Kansas City, Kansas, a heavy construction firm. I am also president of the Mississippi Valley Association and appear here as a representative of that Association and its members.

The Mississippi Valley Association, now in its 50th year, is the Nation's largest water resource development organization with membership extending into 42 states and including nearly 200 local and regional resource and economic development associations.

Continued dedication to the full development and the proper use of this Country's water and soil resources has put the Mississippi Valley Association in the forefront of resource development organizations and has attracted the support of individuals, corporations and organizations with an underlying membership numbering in the millions.

The value to this Nation of the development of our water and related land resources which has taken place in recent years is obvious to anyone who will look. Actual benefits have been far greater than anyone imagined or projected at the time these projects were authorized and constructed. The record is open and the results prove conclusively that these investments are among the very best capital expenditures our Federal Government has ever made. The benefits of water resource projects compare most favorably with the benefits derived from some of the "social" programs of recent years which were prosecuted without the bother of a benefit-cost ratio.

Last November, former President Johnson sent to Congress a first assessment of the Nation's water resources under the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965. The second paragraph of the former President's letter of transmittal said and I quote, "A Nation that fails to plan intelligently for the development and protection of its precious waters will be condemned to wither because of its shortsightedness. The hard lessons of history are clear, written on the deserted sands and ruins of once proud civilizations."

The letter then pointed out a number of problems relating to all aspects of water and stated, "These problems only illustrate the need to analyze and then to take positive action to assure water resources adequate to the demands of America's future."

The former President concludes with a final paragraph, "Responsible government cannot overlook the importance of water management to the Nation's economy and health. This assessment merits your close attention."

Thus we find a federal program that has clearly demonstrated its value and the national assessment which repeatedly suggests that this work should not only be continued, but expedited. However, instead of getting on with the job, we find ourselves enmeshed in a web of economic jargon attempting to prove the obvious in searching for more terms which can be equated into dollar signs, almost totally ignoring obvious developmental aspects of resource development simply because they cannot be expressed in dollars.

On August 26, 1969, Senator Allen J. Ellender, Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works, Senate Committee on Appropriations, wrote President Nixon a letter which deals with water resources development. We commend this letter to your attention and attach a copy of it as a part of this statement.

Senator Ellender stated, "In spite of the fact that next to the air we breathe, water is our most precious resource, it seems the Bureau of the Budget first looks to the water resources program for a disproportionate share of any contemplated cuts whenever there is a need to reduce federal expenditures.

"If we are to meet the water needs of the 300 million people that you recently estimated will occupy our land by the year 2000, we must not only support adequate annual appropriations for the orderly development of these resources, but it is also essential that the unrealistic and arbitrary restrictions placed upon project evaluations be removed."

In commenting on the Flood Control Act of 1936, Senator Ellender said, "The terms, 'benefits' and 'costs,' have no meaning in the abstract. They must be related to objectives in order to give these terms meaning. Since the passage of that Act, the technicians have chosen national economic efficiency as the sole criteria for project evaluation and have disregarded the phrases, 'in the interest of the general welfare' and 'if the lives and social security of the people are otherwise adversely affected.'

"The result of such an interpretation has been that as far as flood control and hurricane protection projects are concerned, we have become a 'cow society.' If, for instance, a thousand cows were lost in a flood or hurricane, we could consider the economic loss involved since a cow has an economic value in the market, and the monetary losses sustained can be used in the justification of protective works. On the other hand, if a thousand human lives were lost, it would not add one dollar to the all-important economic evaluation of the project. The loss of life and human suffering associated with the havoc wrecked on the Gulf Coast by Hurricane Camille transcends the imagination."

As Senator Ellender pointed out, water resources project evaluation now has a long history, dating at least in its formal aspects, from the Flood Control Act of 1936, which required that navigation and flood control projects could be authorized only "if the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue are in excess of estimated costs. . . ." From that date the benefit-cost project evaluation system was established. Each year since 1936, it seems, it has grown ever more difficult with each new statement on the subject or restatement of the scoring rules for project validity and as each new academic economist

comes to hear about projects in some scholarly seminar. One may well wonder at the insistence from the academics, from the "high-church" economists of the Ivory Tower, and from the obscure but potent bureaucrats in the Bureau of the Budget that water projects survive an especially rigorous test since no other Federal projects or programs suffer such heavy scrutiny and outright doubt. Surely the historic economic success of the water projects is well-documented and water resource development constitutes only a small portion of the annual budgets. Still, the doubts are not dispelled and the scrutiny continues and is intensified. Yet the water development agencies lead the field in economic analysis and in description of project effects!

Though the Task Force Report and this series of hearings have aroused the hopes and expectations of many of us that finally an evaluation system is being devised that will record and account for all the effects of projects to their fullest, including regional effects and social welfare effects on communities and groups, the peril that the objective may be thwarted continues. The thwarting may come at the hands of the Bureau of the Budget, that obscure-to-the-public institution has prevailed in this respect before, notably since 1962, when the previous rules known as Senate Document 97 were promulgated. Those rules were supposed to apply to the Bureaus review of projects as well as to the agencies formulation of projects. Yet it is evident that the B-O-B did not regard the Senate Document 97 rules as binding on the Bureau. The evidence is most conspicuous in regard to "secondary benefits" which were acknowledged by Senate Document 97 to be valid project benefits. The B-O-B ignores such benefits in its project review. How do we know that it will regard any new document any more highly? Can there be reservations in whole or in part?

The concern and the responsibility for public policy and action do not reside entirely or exclusively in the Executive Branch of Government. The Congress has at least an equal role, and this role should not be thwarted by the Bureau of the Budget either by permitting that formidable agency to be umpire and judge or by allowing it to compose its own rules of the game and its own project evaluation principle as though it were some sort of self-appointed collection of philosopher kings. One wonders whether any agency so far removed from political responsibility and one that remains so much unchanged by elections should exercise such power in a democratic society.

Therefore, to offset the reservations and exclusiveness and to assure some measure of responsibility while retaining the proper role of overseer, critic, and commentator, the Bureau of the Budget should be required to use the same set of evaluation principles that are developed through the Water Resources Council, or by the Congress in the event the Water Resources Council fails to act, and not to keep a private set of its own.

Furthermore, the B-O-B should be required to forward all project reports to the Congress within ninety days of their receipt from the Executive Branch departments, just as other Federal and State agencies are required to do. The comments of the B-O-B, of course, with its dissents and objections as well as its praises, should go along with the reports to the Congress. This practice would establish a more forthright process and would permit the Congress to know which features of projects incur particular critical comment. This practice would also bring the B-O-B within the system of overt responsibility. Anything short of this practice will mean continuing a serious deficiency in project evaluation features with a consequent loss for sound water resources development.

The new discount rate has been discussed by others at this series of hearings but it should be pointed out that the new discount rate has adversely affected many of the longer range benefits considered in the evaluation of both new and currently authorized projects. This may result in only partial development of many projects which would otherwise have been developed to their fullest potential. Projects constructed on this basis can probably never be corrected, and the under-development can only result in a disservice to future generations.

Another aspect of the new methods and procedures for project evaluation now being developed that compels comment involves the environmental objective and the environmental account recommended in the Task Force Report. One should note that the Task Force expects that the environmental objective for each project be carefully described and the physical dimensions of the situation specified thoroughly and carefully. The intention here is that the environmental factors and considerations be made as clear and specific as possible in at least physical terms and other dimensions in recognition of the fact that the economic benefits and costs for the environment necessarily are much less susceptible to enumeration and measurement than are the development factors of a project. The specific and clear description that is urged and required by the Task Force will permit the public and the governmental decision-makers to know what they are getting for their money if environmental investments are to be made or what is being retained, preserved or enhanced if a recommendation is made that a project not be constructed or that it be significantly modified as to scale, location, or operation. In other words, it is apparent that emotional and frivolous objections to projects cannot substitute for sound evaluation. The advocates and proponents of the environmental objective must accept the responsibility for stating clearly and cogently the dimensions and significance of that objective in each case as noted on pages 113 through 117 in the Task Force Report.

The Mississippi Valley Association testified before the Water Resources Council on January 13, 1969. Following that testimony, we submitted a supplemental statement on January 20, 1969 entitled, "Additional Benefits Which Should Be Considered in Evaluating Water Resources Projects". In the interest of time, I will not discuss these benefits but have attached this list as a part of my statement.

The Mississippi Valley Association, for more than fifty years, has advocated the full development and proper use of the Nation's water and soil resources as the best capital investment which the Federal Government can make. We believe the results of the projects which have been constructed as a result of this philosophy prove conclusively the wisdom of this approach. This is a program for *all* America and not for protectionists, preservationists or other special interest groups.

The Mississippi Valley Association has been consistent in its approach, as have other resource groups who are dedicated to the principle of "the greatest good for the greatest number."

The preservationists, who insist on mislabeling themselves "conservationists", have also been consistent in advocating that the Nation's resources be dedicated to "perpetual non-use." Fortunately, or unfortunately, as some see it, the United States has progressed beyond the "bow and arrow" society and we must seek to meet the needs of our great grandchildren, not our great grandfathers.

This Country's railroads too have played the part of dinosaurs in the area of water resources development but, unlike the Mississippi Valley Association and the preservationists, they have failed to be consistent. They have been, and are, for water resources development when it benefits their selfish, self-interest but they oppose these same developments when the lines of beneficiaries are not so clearly drawn.

Railroads have been in the forefront in pushing irrigation projects because they are probably the greatest single beneficiaries. Increased agricultural production, and the equipment needed to produce it, must be transported.

Railroads have also been among the greatest beneficiaries of flood control because their tracks parallel the great rivers and they serve the cities which have grown along these rivers.

Railroads are among the chief beneficiaries of navigation projects, although they consistently oppose all of these water projects. The record will show that tonnage hauled by railroads serving areas with improved waterways has been consistently greater than the industry average, as have been the revenues.

What this Nation needs is a program to assure the full and rapid development of its water resources to meet its future needs. What the Task Force must do is develop an evaluation technique which will expedite, not curtail, this development. If the Water Resources Council is unable to do the job which Congress assigned it then the Nation must again look to its elected representatives who are not hamstrung with the phrase "with policy guidance from the Bureau of the Budget."

The Mississippi Valley Association wishes to thank you for this opportunity to present the views of its membership and to commend to you for what appears to be a step in the right direction. We look forward to seeing the fruits of your labor.

ADDITIONAL BENEFITS WHICH SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS

1. The value of resources, both human and physical, that would be used for project construction and maintenance which, in the absence of a project, would be unemployed or underemployed resources.

2. Employment effects as a result of the goods and services produced by a project, and especially those which take place in areas or regions where there has been a past history of unemployment or underemployment, is:

a. Through expansion of capacity of productive resources located in an area.

b. Through better utilization of existing productive capacity in a region.

c. Through location of new productive capacity in a region induced by the water resource project.

d. Through the general response of the business community as a result of increased income flows arising from higher employment levels.

e. Provision of opportunities for resource development occasioned through reduced production costs arising from a water resources project.

3. Contributions to regional development objectives.

a. Increase in total regional income as a result of the effects of projects.

b. Diversification of economic base of a region.

c. Improved redistribution of income within a region resulting in lifting the average per capita income.

d. Enhancing the growth potentials of key areas within a region that serve as focus of improved regional services.

4. Contributions to a more orderly and rational development of urban areas and rural areas.

a. Improved use and management of urban flood plains.

b. Reduction in overall costs of public services (water supply, sewage, recreation) through development of water resource projects as part of overall plans for urban and rural development.

c. Improved linkages between rural and urban areas.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 3, 1969]

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C., August 26, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the past several weeks, the nation has witnessed several natural disasters and near-disasters which have worked extreme hardship on our people. For example, note the following:

The brutal hurricane Camille that wrecked the Gulf Coast and resulted in more than 250 known deaths and perhaps half a billion dollars of property damage in Mississippi and Louisiana alone.

The water shortage that threatened our Capitol City in midsummer, followed immediately by severe flooding in the Washington metropolitan area.

The current floods on the James River in Virginia which may result in as many as 200 lives lost and missing and $150 million in property damage.

Although we do not have the means totally to prevent such natural disasters, this great and wealthy nation certainly does possess the means to fortify our most vulnerable areas against these ravages of nature and to minimize their toll of damage and human suffering.

We do have the know-how to minimize the effects of severe drought on our municipal and industrial water supplies. We do have the ability to prevent flooding of our great river valleys. We do know how to minimize the impact of the tidal waves which accompany coastal storms.

The fact is, however, that we are doing far too little either of a preventive or of a developmental nature and are in fact annually *decreasing*, rather than increasing, our actual effort in the field of water resources and flood control projects.

This unfortunate situation seems to me to call for a reevaluation of our priorities in the allocation of Federal funds. In effect, the Congress and the Administration must become as generous and as urgently concerned in our efforts to guard against damage resulting from hurricanes and floods as you yourself have been in your recent efforts to bring relief and rehabilitation to those who have suffered so gravely on the Gulf Coast and in Virginia.

Appropriations for water resource development has been a matter of concern to me for a number of years. On April fourteenth of this year, the senior Senator from West Virginia, Senator Randolph, discussed on the floor of the Senate a statement which Budget Director Robert P. Mayo had made before the Senate Committee on Finance, indicating that he was considering a freeze on public works construction. I joined in the colloquy that followed Senator Randolph's statement, at which time I discussed my growing concern over the delays in the completion schedule on most of the going public works projects which had been revealed to our Committee during the hearings on the Public Works appropriation bill. I concluded my remarks by restating my belief that we must do what we can to protect our two most important resources, land and water. If we failed to do that, our country will sustain great losses.

Subsequently, in May, I addressed the National Rivers and Harbors Convention, at which time I pointed out that in 1964 the construction program of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation was $1,188,428,700, or about 1.09% of the 1964 budget. I noted that for fiscal year 1970, the original budget request for these two agencies was $1,038,920,000, or about .49% of the budget.

The request for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation was subsequently cut by your Administration by $181 million. The revised budget represents a dollar reduction in the past six years of about 15.39%. When you take into account the rise in the cost of construction, the level of appropriations in the revised budget for these agencies represents a drop in construction capability of about 50% since 1964!

Similarly, the efforts being made by the Federal Government to control air and water pollution are completely inadequate to cope with the severe damage these problems are working on our environment and, in fact, on the very health of our citizens. For instance, in the last few years that the Federal Water Pollution Control program has been under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Public Works, I have noticed an increased disparity between the authorization for construction grants for sewerage treatment facilities and the appropriations requested, as indicated below.

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation request in the budget	Percent of authorization request in budget
1968	450,000,000	200,000,000	44.4
1969	700,000,000	203,000,000	29.0
1970	1,000,000,000	214,000,000	21.4

I have received well over 1,000 letters from individuals and organizations urging the Committee on Appropriations to provide the full amount authorized for construction grants for fiscal year 1970. Most of these letters point out the extent to which the states and their political subdivisions have approved bond issues to finance the non-federal costs, relying on the Federal Government's ability to meet its share of the cost.

In spite of the fact that next to the air we breathe, water is our most precious resource, it seems the Bureau of the Budget first looks to the water resource program for a disproportionate share of any contemplated cuts whenever there is a need to reduce Federal expenditures.

If we are to meet the water needs of the 300 million people that you recently estimated will occupy our land by the year 2000, we must not only support adequate annual appropriatons for the orderly development of these resources, but it is also essential that the unrealistic and arbitrary restrictions placed on project evaluations be removed.

For instance, the basis for the benefit-to-cost ratio for water resource projects had its origin in the 1936 Flood Control Act, where the policy was established that the Federal Government should improve or participate in the improvement of rivers and other waterways for flood control purposes in the interest of the general welfare if the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue are in excess of the estimated cost and if the lives and social security of people are otherwise adversely affected.

The terms, "benefits" and "costs," have no meaning in the abstract. They must be related to objectives in order to give these term meaning. Since the passage of that Act, the technicians have chosen national economic efficiency as the sole criteria for project evaluation and have disregarded the phrases, "in the interest of the general welfare" and "if the lives and social security of the people are otherwise adversely affected."

The result of such an interpretation has been that as far as flood control and hurricane protection projects are concerned, we have become a "cow society." If, for instance, a thousand cows were lost in a flood or hurricane, we could consider the economic loss involved since a cow has an economic value in the market, and the monetary losses sustained can be used in the justification of protective works. On the other hand, if a thousand human lives were lost, it would not add one dollar to the all-important economic evaluation of the project. The loss of life and human suffering associated with the havoc wrecked on the Gulf Coast by Hurricane Camille transcends the imagination.

Fortunately, the Water Resources Council is attempting to find a way to deal with this problem of recognizing loss of life and misery associated with disastrous floods, by setting up four separate accounts which recognize national objectives other than economic efficiency such as regional development, environmental benefits, and the well being of man. The Council's efforts along these lines are to be commended and they deserve and need your personal encouragement.

Had the center of Camille been 50 miles east, the damage to New Orleans in terms of lives lost and property damaged would have been incalculable. Yet, despite this near miss and in spite of the constant threat of hurricane damage to the New Orleans area, the hurricane protection project for Lake Pontchartrain will continue to drag along with inadequate appropriations, unless the Administration loosens the purse strings and cooperates with the Congress in revamping the national priorities vis-a-vis such projects.

The budget estimate for this project for fiscal year 1967 was $450,000 for planning, at a time when the Corps of Engineers had a capability of $1,600,000, which would have permitted the initiation of construction. Recognizing the potential danger to New Orleans, the Congress provided the full capability of the Corps of Engineers.

For fiscal year 1968, the original budget was $2,300,000, which was subsequently revised to $3,260,000, at a time when the Corps' capability was $4,500,000. Again, recognizing the potential loss of life and property, the Congress approved the $4,500,000.

For fiscal year 1969, the budget estimate was $7,800,000, compared with a Corps capability of $10,800,000. But in view of the expenditure ceiling contained in the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, the Committee, although recognizing the risk involved in not moving forward expeditiously on this project, did not increase the budgeted amount for this project or any other project in the bill.

For fiscal year 1970, the budget estimate is only $6 million, compared with the Corps capability of $8,500,000. Neither New Orleans nor the nation can afford the gamble of procrastination on this project.

Similarly, the hurricane protection project, New Orleans to Venice, proceeds at an alarmingly slow rate. Since 1967, the estimated completion date for this project has slipped from June 1975 to December 1977.

Two years ago, I secured authorization for a study of the Louisiana coastal area, looking toward hurricane protection, the protection of the physical features of the coastline, and reestablishment of the former ecology of the area which contributed so much not only to the wildlife but to the marine resources of the entire Gulf Coast. Naturally, I was disappointed this year to find that the budget provided only $60,000 for the continuation of this study in fiscal year 1970. At least double that amount will be required for satisfactory progress on the study, and I intend to urge my subcommittee and the Congress to expedite the project to this extent, at a minimum.

A few weeks ago, this nation—indeed, the whole world—was thrilled when man first set foot on the moon. In reflecting on this accomplishment, I had occasion to recall the hearings which I had recently completed on the Public Works appropriation bill, where the effect of the budget cuts which your Administration made in an already austere budget submitted by President Johnson were graphically revealed to the Committee.

Among the most serious cuts that I recall

were those affecting the Southern Nevada Water District, the Folsom South Canal in Southern California, the Bonneville unit of Central Utah Project, the Chatfield Reservoir in Colorado, the Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers Project in New Jersey, the Wynoochee Reservoir in Washington, the New Melones Reservoir in California, the Lake Kemp Reservoir in Texas, and many more.

In a number of cases, we are finding that the expenditure ceilings imposed on the Corps will not permit contractors to pursue their work in accordance with the terms of the existing contracts, even though in many cases the funds are available or requested. Failure to provide funds and expenditure ceilings adequate to permit accomplishment of existing contracts inevitably will increase costs on all Government contracts and could even result in legal actions being taken by the contractor against the Government. I cannot help but feel that our priorities are out of balance.

These thoughts led me to a review of the requests for research and development appropriations requested by President Johnson for the NASA program, and I found that he had requested $3,051,427,000. Further research revealed that in the review of the 1970 budget, your Administration recommended a reduction of $45 million in this program, of about 1½%. In contrast, the "Construction, General" appropriation request of $769,420,000 for the Corps of Engineers was cut $142,415,000, or about 18½%. I realize that our space program is based on a national objective—but so is our water resource program.

It would require a good deal of imagination to attempt to identify the tangible benefits that will result from man's flight to the moon. Any attempt at a monetary evaluation of those benefits would be almost impossible. If, however, these benefits could be identified and evaluated, the realization of most of the benefits would be projected far into the future.

If we applied the same economic principles to the benefit-cost evaluation of our space program as are required in our water resource program (where future benefits are discounted at a rate of 4⅞ percent) the benefits expected to result from the space program would shrink drastically. For instance, benefits evaluated at $1 million to be realized 25 years from now would be worth only $304,200 in terms of economic justification for a project under today's regulations. A $1 million benefit to be realized 50 years from now would provide justification for the expenditure of only $92,600 today. Such a system would probably kill the space program, just as it is now strangling our vital water resources, flood control and hurricane protection programs.

I am enclosing a list of selected hurricanes and their damages, compiled from information provided by the Office of Emergency Preparedness. It should be recognized that many hurricanes of earlier years are not listed. In fact, during the recorded history of Louisiana alone at least 150 hurricanes or tropical storms have battered or threatened the coast of my state.

I think it is interesting to note that, based only on the partial statistics available to us, the average damage from hurricanes since the turn of the century is over $85 million per year. During the last 30 years, the damage averaged $185 million. During the last 20 years, the damage averaged $200 million and during the 10-year period from 1958 to 1968, the damage averaged about $320 million. If this progression continues, we can expect average damages of $500 million a year (or a total of $5 billion) over the next decade.

Such damage tabulations are always on the conservative side because, by their nature, they tend to exclude many categories of physical and economic loss. As I have already mentioned, the loss of human life is a factor that is incalculable in monetary terms. In addition, there are the inaccuracy of complete inventory estimates, the impossibility of fixing replacement costs, the loss of business and trade to local enterprises and to the local economy in general, the loss of employment income, the loss of earning ability by those who are too old to "get started" again and who instead become public charges. All of these factors and many others add substantially to the damage estimates that are ascribed to various hurricanes.

Yet even these staggering figures tell only part of the story of the "cost" of hurricanes, for they generally do not include the multimillion dollar rehabilitation expenditures by Federal, State and local governments following the disaster. In the case of Camille, the Army, Navy, Air Force, NASA, SBA, HUD, HEW, GSA, USDA, OEP, and numerous other federal agencies are spending large sums to assist in the recovery effort. Also, in terms of the federal costs, over the next several years both individual and corporate tax payers will be deducting from their income taxes considerable sums to which they are eligible as a result of the hurricane damages suffered.

All things considered, we might properly *double* the so-called "damage estimates." In order that you might see the disparity between these enormous damages and the feeble efforts being made to provide protection, I am also enclosing a status report of the authorized hurricane protection projects for your review.

In view of the magnitude of the floods that this nation has experienced this year, the recent hurricane, and the lack of adequate progress being made in meeting the water resource needs of our expanding population, I expect that our Committee will respond to the needs of the Country. I cannot help but feel that you also will want to take another look at your recommendations for water resource development projects, particularly those relating to health, safety and the protection of human life, prior to the time the Congress acts on the Public Works appropriation requests you have submitted, and I urge that you do so.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter with you personally, or with a small bipartisan group of concerned members of the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works.

AUTHORIZED HURRICANE PROTECTION PROJECTS

Project	Year authorized	Total cost (estimated)	Federal cost	Appropriation to date	1970 budget	Capability of Corps
Freeport, Tex	1962	$19,000,000	$13,300,000	$4,637,000	$2,200,000	$2,200,000
Port Arthur, Tex	1962	59,900,000	41,600,000	8,557,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Texas City, Tex	1958, 1968	44,714,000	31,200,000	15,132,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Lake Pontchartrain, La	1965	166,000,000	113,562,000	12,498,000	6,000,000	8,500,000
Morgan City and vicinity, Louisiana	1965	6,067,000	4,180,000	347,000	150,000	200,000
New Orleans to Venice, La	1962	43,400,000	25,885,000	1,654,000	950,000	1,400,000
Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana	1965	11,310,000	3,393,000	408,000		0
Hillsborough Bay, Fla	1968	13,088,200	9,163,200			15,000
North River dike, North Carolina	1966	500,000	358,000			(1)
Top Sail Beach and Surf City, N.C	1966	2,500,000	1,430,000			(1)
Brunswick County beaches, North Carolina	1966	24,400,000	14,400,000			110,000
Hyde County dike, North Carolina	1966	3,272,000	2,290,000			60,000
Neuse River barrier, North Carolina	1965	15,900,000	11,100,000			100,000
Ocracoke Island, N.C	1965	2,150,000	1,880,000	109,000		500,000
Bodie Island, N.C	1966	16,400,000	8,800,000			(1)
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, N.Y	1960	68,600,000	33,900,000	3,578,000	500,000	500,000

[1] Awaiting action by local interests.

RECENT HURRICANES AND TROPICAL STORMS

Name	Date	Areas affected	Deaths	Estimated damage (millions)
Carol	August 1954	North Carolina to Maine	60	$461
Edna	September 1954	New Jersey to Maine	21	7
Hazel	October 1954	South Carolina to New York	95	252
Connie	August 1955	North Carolina to New York	25	46
Dianne	do	North Carolina to New England	184	832
Ione	September 1955	North Carolina	7	88
Audrey	June 1957	Texas and Louisiana	390	150
Donna	August 1960	Florida to New England	50	500
Carla	September 1961	Texas and Louisiana	46	408
Great Atlantic coast storm	March 1962	Florida to New England	33	200
Cleo	August 1964	Florida	3	129
Hilda	October 1964	Louisiana	38	100
Betsy	August 1965	Florida and Louisiana	75	1,420
Alma	June 1966	Florida	7	7
Beulah	September 1967	Texas	15	500
Gladys	September 1968	Florida	5	7
Camille	August 1969	Central gulf coast and Virginia	500	750

EASTLAND-HRUSKA MEMORANDUM, JUSTICE DEPARTMENT FILE, AND HRUSKA-REHNQUIST CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING THE NOMINATION OF CLEMENT F. HAYNSWORTH, JR., TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, yesterday I released to the members of the Judiciary Committee and to the press, copies of the Justice Department file on the investigation made concerning the conduct of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in participating in the decision of that court in the case of *Darlington Manufacturing Company* v. *National Labor Relations Board*, 325 F. 2d 682. Simultaneously, Senator HRUSKA and I issued a memorandum pertaining to the facts as shown by this file.

On September 2, 1969, Senator HRUSKA requested the Attorney General of the

United States to review this matter, and in response to that letter Hon. William H. Rehnquist, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, wrote a letter to Senator HRUSKA.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum, the copy of the file, and a copy of the exchange of letters between Senator HRUSKA and Mr. Rehnquist be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF SENATORS EASTLAND AND HRUSKA RELATING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FILE ON JUDGE CLEMENT F. HAYNSWORTH, JR.

Certain questions have been raised as to the propriety of the participation by Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, in the decision of the case of *Darlington Manufacturing Company vs. National Labor Relations Board,* 325 F. 2d 682.

We have made a thorough review of all of the charges, allegations, and insinuations pertaining to these questions, and, in our considered judgment, a study of the facts clearly shows that these charges, allegations, and insinuations are utterly baseless.

In our judgment, it is clear that Judge Haynsworth owned no stock in any of the companies or corporations that were litigants in that case, that he had no financial interest or stake in the outcome of the litigation, and that he could not have been actuated or motivated by any hope of pecuniary gain in deciding the case.

With the permission of the Department of Justice we are today releasing copies of the entire file of the Department's investigation of this matter, and we are also releasing as a separate package copies of the eight most pertinent letters in that file.

A reading of these documents reveals the following facts:

That the Judges of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals carefully and painstakingly investigated all aspects of the conduct of Judge Haynsworth in participating in the decision of the *Darlington* case, including all surrounding circumstances, and completely exonerated him of any improper or unethical conduct;

That these findings of the Judges, along with the files, were submitted to the Attorney General of the United States, Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, who unqualifiedly approved the findings;

And that after the true facts had been established, the person who originally made the charges against Judge Haynsworth to Judge Simon E. Sobeloff, then Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals, Miss Patricia Eames, Assistant General Counsel of the Textile Workers Union of America, acknowledged that the charges made against Judge Haynsworth were unfounded.

It has been suggested by some persons that the thorough investigation conducted by the Judges of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, led by Judge Sobeloff, and of the Justice Department only considered charges of bribery against Judge Haynsworth, and did not consider his conduct in the light of the issues of judicial ethics and conflict-of-interest. Thus, such persons contend that the question of *propriety* of Judge Haynsworth's conduct has never been resolved.

A study of these documents compels the conclusion that there is no basis for this contention. Rather, there is an abundance of evidence to show that the Judges and the Justice Department considered *all* aspects of Judge Haynsworth's conduct, including the questions of judicial ethics and conflict-of-interest, and that Judge Haynsworth was absolved of any misconduct.

The text of the letter of December 17, 1963, from Miss Eames to Chief Judge Sobeloff, which first made the charges and which initiated the investigation by the Judges of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals shows that questions were raised not only as to possible bribery, but also as to propriety and ethical conduct. We quote from portions of Miss Eames' letter found on page 3 thereof:

"Depending on a number of facts which we do not know but which could be discovered by an investigation with subpoena powers, there may or may not be violations of 18 U.S.C. sections 201 and 202. It would appear, however, that only one fact which is now unknown—namely whether or not the Deering Milliken contract was thrown to Carolina Vend-A-Matic needs to be known in order to conclude that Judge Haynsworth should have disqualified himself from participating in this decision.

"Whether or not a criminal violation has occurred, we certainly believe that if the Deering Milliken contract was thrown to Carolina Vend-A-Matic, Judge Haynsworth should be disqualified from participating in the decision in this case, and that the resulting two-to-two decision should lead to the sustaining of the NLRB decision below."

After referring to the bribery statutes, 18 U.S.C. sections 201 and 202, Miss Eames stated that whether or not a violation of the bribery statutes had occurred that Judge Haynsworth should have disqualified himself and that his vote should not have been counted in the decision of the case. Obviously, this raised the questions of ethical conduct and conflict-of-interest.

It is just as obvious that Judge Sobeloff and the other Judges of the Fourth Circuit in their thorough investigation did not restrict themselves to implications or insinuations as to alleged bribery, but rather, thoroughly examined the ethical aspects of the conduct of Judge Haynsworth. The concluding paragraph of Judge Sobeloff's letter of February 18, 1964, to Miss Eames illuminates this point:

"It thus appears that the information received, anonymously, by you was completely unfounded, and it is gratifying that after mature consideration you are convinced of this. However unwarranted the allegation, *since the propriety of the conduct of a member of this court has been questioned,* I am today, at Judge Haynsworth's request and with the concurrence of the entire court, sending the file to the Department of Justice, together with an expression of our full confidence in Judge Haynsworth." (emphasis added). Judge Sobeloff made the following statement in his letter of February 18, 1964, to Attorney General Kennedy:

"Enclosed is the file of correspondence passing between our court and counsel for the Textile Workers Union of America and Deering Milliken Corporation following the argument of an appeal in our court. Inasmuch as this relates to alleged conduct of one of our colleagues, we think it appropriate to pass the file on to the Department of Justice."

The "alleged conduct" to which Judge Sobeloff referred clearly relates to "the propriety of the conduct of a member of this court" mentioned by him in his letter of the same date to Miss Eames.

Judge Sobeloff concluded his letter to Attorney General Kennedy as follows:

"I wish to add on behalf of the members of the court that our independent investigation has convinced us that there is no warrant whatever for these assertions and insinuations, and we express our complete confidence in Judge Haynsworth."

After a review of the file by the Justice Department, Attorney General Kennedy replied to Judge Sobeloff on February 28, 1964, as follows:

"This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated February 18, 1964, enclosing the file that reflects your investigation of certain assertions and insinuations about Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr.

"Your thorough and complete investigation reflects that the charges were without foundation. I share your expression of complete confidence in Judge Haynsworth.

"Thanks for bringing this matter to my attention."

Such a ringing endorsement of the conduct of Judge Haynsworth, such broad and spacious language, cannot be reasonably taken to be restricted to charges of alleged bribery, but certainly must include all facets of Judge Haynsworth's official conduct, including the questions of ethics and propriety.

If the Justice Department review of the file had indicated that Judge Haynsworth was innocent of any violations of the criminal law, but that his ethical conduct was questionable, then surely Attorney General Kennedy would have spoken in more guarded language and would have hedged his "expression of complete confidence in Judge Haynsworth."

Senator Hruska has recently requested the Department of Justice to reexamine the conduct of Judge Haynsworth in this matter as it relates to the standards of judicial ethics.

Honorable William H. Rehnquist, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, has submitted a thorough and well-reasoned reply to the inquiry of Senator Hruska. This Opinion of the Justice Department closely examines all of the pertinent facts and circumstances relating to the conduct of Judge Haynsworth taking part in the *Darlington* decision, and comes to the conclusion that his conduct in that case comported with the laws of the United States, the Canons of Judicial Ethics, and the Canons of Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association.

The Opinion concludes that Judge Haynsworth should not have recused himself or been disqualified from participating in the decision of the *Darlington* case, and that in light of the facts he was under a duty to take part in that decision.

The Opinion further states that the opinions of the American Bar Association Committee on Professional Ethics and the decisions of state and federal courts confirm the conclusion that Judge Haynsworth acted properly, and that this conclusion is supported by common sense ethical considerations.

Two members of the Senate Judiciary Committee have requested additional information pertaining to certain additional facts and circumstances relating to Judge Haynsworth's participation in the *Darlington* decision. It is our understanding that this additional requested information is in the process of being furnished.

We firmly believe that a review of the presently known undisputed facts pertaining to this matter will lead to the inescapable conclusion that it affords no basis for opposing the nomination of Judge Haynsworth to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., December 17, 1963.

Hon. SIMON E. SOBELOFF,
Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, Richmond, Va.

DEAR JUDGE SOBELOFF: I have taken the liberty of marking this letter as "personal" because I believe that you should be the first person to see it. It is written to you in your capacity as Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals.

The consolidated Deering Milliken cases were decided by the Fourth Circuit on Friday, November 15, 1963. On the morning of Wednesday, November 20th, our Union received a telephone call in which the caller,

who said that he would not identify himself, stated substantially the following:

I believe that you should know that Judge Haynsworth, who voted against your Union in the Deering Milliken case is the First Vice President of Carolina Vend-A-Matic Company, and that two days after the decision in the Deering Milliken case, Deering Milliken cancelled its contracts with the company or companies which previously supplied vending machines to all of the numerous Deering Milliken mills in the Carolinas, and proceeded to sign a new contract with the Carolina Vend-A-Matic Company pursuant to which that Company would supply vending machines to all Deering Milliken mills.

We immediately proceeded to do what we could to check the accuracy of this allegation. The first element checked out readily; there is no doubt that Judge Haynsworth is or was until very recently the First Vice President of Carolina Vend-A-Matic Company. (We do not know the extent, if any, of his shareholding in the corporation, but we are informed that he has been the First Vice President since the company was founded, and that the Judge's former partner in the law firm of Haynsworth, Perry, Bryant, Marion and Johnston, in Greenville, Mr. W. Francis Marion, is and has been the President of Carolina Vend-A-Matic Company.) As to the second element of the allegation—that regarding the throwing of the Deering Milliken vending machine contracts to Carolina Vend-A-Matic—we were first informed that a notice was posted in the Drayton Mill of the Deering Milliken chain at some time prior to December 11th of this year stating that as of January 1st, a complete new set of vending machines would be installed in the mill; we were later informed that the most recent story was that as of January 1, Deering Milliken would *take bids from* vending machine companies.

We have seen two credit reports on Carolina Vend-A-Matic Company. (These reports are not our property.) The first of these reports was dated October 18, 1963. The report stated that it was based upon an interview on October 8, 1963 with the general manager of Carolina Vend-A-Matic, Mr. Wade Dennis. (The interview could not have been held any earlier than October 1, 1963, since it includes the statement that volume for *the first nine months* of 1963 had increased about 25% over that for the corresponding period of 1962.) This report stated that the First Vice President of the corporation was Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr. It further stated that annual estimated sales were $2,000,000. It happened that there was a typographical discrepancy in the report: On the first page the report stated that the company had been founded in 1960; on the second page the founding date was stated as 1950.

A second report had been sought to reconcile this typographical discrepancy. The discrepancy was corrected (the proper date was 1950) in a report sent out on December 3rd entitled "substitute Report of Even Date [presumably October 18]: Correcting Errors in Composition." This report, still stating that it was based upon the October 8th interview, claimed that "C. F. Haynsworth, Jr., formerly shown as First Vice President resigned about September 1, 1963 and no one has been elected to that office." (The corrected report further states that annual sales were estimated at $3,000,000, an increase of a million dollars—which could represent the Deering Milliken contract.) This is apparently an attempt *retroactively* to create a September, 1963 resignation from corporate office for Judge Haynsworth, since the first report of the October 8th interview (which had to have been written later than September 30th) stated that Judge Haynsworth *was* the First Vice President.

I am sure you can imagine that our union is gravely disturbed. After having lost a case of the most serious importance by one vote, we have been informed that the party which won the case awarded a significant contract to a firm in which one of the judges was interested. The allegations have checked out: (1) In fact, the Judge was (at least until recently) an officer of the corporation, and there has been an effort to hide that fact, and (2) in fact, a notice was posted in the mill at Drayton that the vending machines were to be changed.

Thus far, the allegations are clear and definite—the kind of thing that clearly means something if it is true. Because we see these allegations checking out as apparently true, then we begin to wonder about the import of facts whose significance is less clear. For example, we are informed that Judge Haynsworth is extremely close to former Senator Charles Daniels, who in turn is extremely close to Roger Milliken. If this fact stood alone, we would endeavor not to to be perturbed by it, but it does not. Knowing these facts, we cannot help but suspect that the reason why Deering Milliken moved for a hearing en banc was to be sure to have Judge Haynsworth on the panel. We cannot help but wonder whether the sentence in the decision regarding print cloth, which was evidently not a part of Judge Bryan's original text (since it was added in handwriting to the typed manuscript) and which the Court has subsequently, on its own motion, omitted from the decision, was not introduced at Judge Haynsworth's suggestion and then withdrawn at his suggestion because Deering Milliken had pointed out to him that by going this far, he had caused the opinion flatly to contradict the record in the case.

We of course have no subpoena power. We cannot examine the officers and look into the books of the vending machine corporation or corporations which previously had the Deering Milliken contract (the chief among which corporations we believe to be the Spartamatic Corporation of Spartanburg, South Carolina), the records of which should presumably reflect any contract cancellation which may have occurred and the date of such a cancellation. Depending on a number of facts which we do not know but which could be discovered by an investigation with subpoena powers, there may or may not be violations of 18 U.S.C. sections 201 and 202. It would appear, however, that only one fact which is now unknown—namely whether or not the Deering Milliken contract was thrown to Carolina Vend-A-Matic—needs to be known in order to conclude that Judge Haynsworth should have disqualified himself from participating in this decision.

We had intended to wait until January 1st to see whether Carolina Vend-A-Matic machines were installed on that date as the notice at Drayton suggested. But the making of the changes in the financial report and the story regarding a taking of bids suggest that Carolina Vend-A-Matic may already fear discovery and consequently have begun an effort to cover its tracks.

We believe that an investigation should be made immediately. We do not know whether we ourselves should ask the Justice Department to investigate or whether we should leave the handling of this matter entirely up to you. It is clear to us that you are the first person to whom the matter should be referred. Whether or not a criminal violation has occurred, we certainly believe that if the Deering Milliken contract was thrown to Carolina Vend-A-Matic, Judge Haynsworth should be disqualified from participating in the decision in this case, and that the resulting two-to-two decision should lead to the sustaining of the NLRB decision below.

If you have any questions to ask of our Union, either I or anyone else in this organization to whom you may wish to speak will make himself immediately available to you.

Very truly yours,

PATRICIA EAMES,
Attorney for Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO.

RICHMOND, VA., *January 7, 1964.*

THORNTON W. BROOKS, ESQ.,
McLendon, Brim, Holderness & Brooks,
Greensboro, N.C.

STUART N. UPDIKE, ESQ.,
Townley, Updike, Carter & Rodgers,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: Enclosed to each of you is a copy of a letter I have this day written to Miss Patricia Eames, counsel for Textile Workers Union of America, together with a copy of a letter addressed to me by her on December 17, 1963.

The court will be glad to receive any comment from you or your clients. It is suggested that a copy of any communication to the court should be sent to opposing counsel.

Sincerely,

SIMON E. SOBELOFF.

RICHMOND, VA., *January 7, 1964.*

Miss PATRICIA EAMES,
Textile Workers Union of America,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MISS EAMES: Your letter of December 17, 1963, addressed to me at Richmond, was forwarded to my Baltimore office but an answer was delayed because I was out of the city, recuperating from a recent illness. When our term opened yesterday your letter was placed before the court. An inquiry will be made into the subject matter about which you wrote me, and I will communicate with you further.

Sincerely,

SIMON E. SOBELOFF.

TOWNLEY, UPDIKE, CARTER & RODGERS,
New York, N.Y., December 10, 1964.

Re *Darlington Mfg. Co. et al.* v. *NLRB.*

Hon. SIMON E. SOBELOFF,
Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, Richmond, Va.

DEAR JUDGE SOBELOFF: We acknowledge your letter of January 7, 1964, together with the enclosures mentioned. It would have been sooner acknowledged but for my absence, because of illness, on the day of its arrival.

Our preliminary inquires indicate that, so far as the facts are within the knowledge of ourselves and of our client, Deering Milliken, Inc., the innuendoes and charges by TWUA counsel against our client and Judge Haynsworth with regard to vending machines in the Drayton Mill are utterly without foundation in fact.

We have already begun a thorough investigation of the facts to enable us promptly to accept the Court's invitation to submit comments. We shall of course comply with the Court's direction that copies of all communications be supplied to opposing counsel. In doing so, however, we would assume that all correspondence between the Court and counsel on this subject is to be considered sealed and not available for public inspection or distribution, pending further directions from the Court.

Respectfully,

STUART N. UPDIKE.

MCLENDON BRIM, HOLDERNESS & BROOKS,
Greensboro, N.C., January 13, 1964.

Hon. SIMON E. SOBELOFF,
Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Richmond, Va.

DEAR JUDGE SOBELOFF: Your letter of January 7, with enclosures, was received by my office during my absence. The serious allegations and inferences contained in the letter of Miss Eames compel me to promptly reply to the extent possible at this time. The Court has solicited the comment of counsel or their clients, and I am replying on behalf of my client, Darlington Manufacturing Company, although it is no longer in existence. I understand that counsel for Deering Milliken, Inc., will communicate with the Court in due course as to Carolina Vend-A-Matic Com-

pany, about which I have no knowledge whatsoever.

My comments on the other points are as follows:

1. *En banc court.* Miss Eames states at page 2, paragraph 5, "we cannot help but suspect that the reason why Deering Milliken moved for a hearing en banc was to be sure to have Judge Haynesworth [sic] on the panel." Miss Eames' suspicion is totally unwarranted insofar as my client or myself are concerned. The reason why Darlington petitioned for an en banc hearing is set forth in its petition of 30 May. In brief, the reason there stated was:

"This Court wisely utilized the power to initiate an en banc hearing sua sponte in Docket No. 8908, *Simkins, et al. v. Moses H. Cone Memorial Hospital, et al.*, argued on 1 April 1963. Counsel for the parties in that case, including counsel for the Petitioner herein, were unanimous in the view that it was helpful to utilize the power of the Court to have an en banc hearing. This Court has wisely heeded the admonition of the Supreme Court that the en banc power convened by § 46(c) is too useful for a court ever 'to ignore the possibilities of its use in cases where its use might be appropriate.' In less than one year's time, this Court has heard the following cases en banc:" (Nine cases listed.)

I sincerely considered at the time that if it was wise for the Court to initiate an en banc hearing sua sponte in the *Simkins* case, certainly the importance of the present case warranted the invocation of an en banc court, particularly considering the fact that the National Labor Relations Board had decided the case by a three to two decision. Furthermore, my position for an en banc court noted that as four of the five judges of this Court were already familiar with some aspects of the case, it was particularly appropriate that "all members of the Court pool their wisdom in the hearing and the ultimate determination of these complex proceedings." Interestingly enough, the opinion of the majority was written by Judge Bryan who was the only member of the Court who had not previously participated in some of the proceedings related to the case.

Subsequently, both the National Labor Relations Board and the Union, through their counsel, responded to the petition by notifying the Court that they had no objection to the motion for a hearing and determination of the proceedings en blanc.

2. *Deletion of sentence in order.* Miss Eames states at page 2, paragraph 5, that "We cannot help but wonder whether the sentence in the decision regarding print cloth . . . was not introduced at Judge Haynsworth's suggestion and then withdrawn at his suggestion because Deering Milliken had pointed out to him that by going this far, he had caused the opinion flatly to contradict the record in the case." I do not know who introduced the sentence in question into the decision, but I do know who suggested that it be modified or withdrawn. The Clerk mailed to counsel for the parties a photocopy of the decision when it was entered and filed. I am enclosing the photocopy of page 9 of the decision as sent to me and this shows that my copy did not contain the sentence in question. On 20 November Mr. Schoemer called me over long distance telephone from his law office in New York, after he had received his photocopy of the opinion, and in the course of our conversation I learned for the first time that my copy did not contain the inserted sentence. Thereafter I telephoned the Clerk to ascertain if the sentence had been inadvertently omitted from my copy, and as to the exact language in the official copy. The Clerk then examined the record and advised that the sentence should have been written into my copy as well. I then advised the Clerk that in my opinion the statement was not entirely correct and I requested him to call my views to Judge Bryan's attention so that changes, if any, that might be made by the Court in the opinion could be handled before the opinion was sent to the printer; I also asked the Clerk to advise me if it was necessary for me to officially call the matter to the Court's attention by means of a formal document. I did not hear further from the Clerk, nor from any member of the Court, until I received the order of December 9, 1963, wherein the sentence was ordered deleted. The suggestion to Judge Bryan that the added sentence in his written opinion was not entirely supported by the record originated solely with me, and was transmitted by me to Judge Bryan through the Clerk, as indicated.

With respect and esteem, I remain

Sincerely yours,

THORNTON H. BROOKS.

[Enclosure]

"There is no decided case", the Board candidly states, "directly dispositive of Darlington's claim that it had an absolute right to close its mill, irrespective of motive". While a number of the decisions on the point mention the presence of a legitimate economic reason in connection with the right to close, an analysis of them discloses that they do not declare the existence of such a reason to be indispensible to the validity of the closing. See e.g., NLRB v. Preston Food Corp., 309 F.2d 946, 352 (4 Cir. 1962); NLRB v. New England Web, Inc., 309 F.2d 696, 700 (1 Cir. 1962); NLRB v. Rapid Bindery, Inc., 293 F.2d 170, 173 (2 Cir. 1961); Union Drawn Steel Co. v. NLRB, 109 F.2d 587, 592 (3 Cir. 1940). Nor are there precedents for the proposition that an owner or operator cannot go out of business at his option if the closure is intended to be, and is in truth, absolute and permanent. These authorities, we think, support the view that if the termination is without intent to resume the business elsewhere—as a runaway—the power to close, even if spurred by unionization, is not precluded by the act.

RICHMOND, VA.,
January 13, 1969.

Re *Darlington Mfg. Co., et al.*, v. *NLRB.*

STUART N. UPDIKE, Esq.,
Townley, Updike, Carter & Rodgers, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. UPDIKE: Thank you for your letter of January 10. The court will await your further communication.

Your suggestion that all correspondence between the court and counsel on this subject should not be available for public inspection or distribution pending further direction from the court, is, of course, correct.

Sincerely,

SIMON E. SOBELOFF.

TOWNLEY, UPDIKE, CARTER & RODGERS,
New York, N.Y., January 13, 1964.

Re *Darlington Mfg. Co. et al.* v. *NLRB.*

HON. SIMON E. SOBELOFF,
Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, Richmond, Va.

DEAR JUDGE SOBELOFF: I regret that I must call to the Court's attention that the date "December 10, 1964" on my letter sent to you last Friday should read "January 10, 1964". Please accept my apologies for the error.

Respectfully,

STUART N. UPDIKE.

TOWNLEY, UPDIKE, CARTER & RODGERS,
New York, N.Y., January 17, 1964.

HON. SIMON E. SOBELOFF,
Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, Richmond, Va.

DEAR JUDGE SOBELOFF: This will supplement our letter of January 10, 1964, acknowledged by your letter of January 13, 1964, for which we thank you.

On January 12, a member of our staff was dispatched to Spartanburg, South Carolina, to make a full investigation of the relevant facts concerning vending machine operations in Deering Milliken mills. (We are using that term in this letter generically to identify the mills which sell their products through Deering Milliken, Inc.) The investigation was made by John P. Reiner, Esq., who joined the staff of this firm on January 2, 1964 after service as law secretary to Chief Judge Sylvester J. Ryan, followed by service as an Assistant United States Attorney, both of the Southern District of New York. He has submitted to us a written report, backed up by copies of the relevant documents. This letter is based thereon.

The investigation was conducted primarily through two sources: (1) Deering Milliken Service Corporation, the purchasing department of which, where requested by a plant manager, advised in obtaining proposals from in-plant feeding contractors at the Deering Milliken mills; and (2) Pacolet Industries, Inc., of which the Drayton Mill is a division. Deering Milliken, Inc., as such, was not involved in the investigation.

By way of preface, we observe that the letter to you from union counsel of December 17, 1963, makes two broad charges with respect to vending machine operations at these mills:

(1) On November 17, 1963, two days after the Court's decision in the Darlington case, "Deering Milliken" cancelled its contracts with the suppliers of vending machines "to all of the numerous Deering Milliken mills in the Carolinas" and transferred or "threw" the business to Carolina Vend-A-Matic Co., Inc. (page 1 of Miss Eames' letter).

(2) While the union has been unable to verify the correctness of the foregoing hearsay report supposedly given it by an anonymous telephone caller, it has established that Drayton Mill has transferred, or as of January 1 would transfer, its vending machine contract to Carolina Vend-A-Matic Co., Inc. (hereafter "Carolina Vend-A-Matic") (page 2 of Miss Eames' letter).

Both these statements are absolutely and unqualifiedly false, as we shall now demonstrate, first dealing with the specific instance of Drayton Mill and then with the other Deering Milliken mills.

As to Drayton Mill: For a number of years, food and beverages at Drayton Mill were supplied in part by an outside independent contractor and in part by the services of mill personnel. Early in 1963, the mill manager questioned whether these operations might not be more efficiently carried out by a single outside independent vending contractor. After investigation of the subject and in late October 1963, the manager decided to transfer these operations to such an outside firm, and enlisted the aid of the purchasing department of Deering Milliken Service Corporation in obtaining proposals. At about this time, a notice was posted on the mill's bulletin board indicating that in the future, but at an unspecified date, vending machine operations would be placed in the hands of an independent contractor.

With the assistance of the purchasing department, five vending companies thought to be interested in supplying food and equipment to the Drayton Mill were invited* to submit proposals to Mr. Rogers, the plant manager. Included in the list of invitees were Carolina Vend-A-Matic and Automatic Food Service, Inc. of Spartanburg, the company which had been supplying beverage vending machines at Drayton Mill for some years. Proposals were received; most, if not all, of the invitees inspected the facilities available at the plant and the plant man-

---

*Each of the invitees, including Carolina Vend-A-Matic, was then supplying food and beverage vending operations to one or more Deering Milliken mills.

ager personally visited the facilities of each of the invitees in order to satisfy himself as to which was likely to supply the best quality food.

On or about December 10, 1963, the plant manager made his determination. To aid in the formulation of his judgment, he prepared a chart on which he tabulated what he regarded as the principal criteria by which each of the invitees was to be judged, and then awarded points to indicate his own evaluation of the invitees' qualifications. By this method. Automatic Food Service, Inc. of Spartanburg, the existing contractor at the mill, emerged with the highest rating; Carolina Vend-A-Matic was second, with a rating about 25% below the first company. Accordingly, Automatic Food Service, Inc. was notified that the contract would be awarded to it, and the four other bidders (including, of course, Carolina Vend-A-Matic) on December 16, 1963 were notified that they had lost out. The contract was signed on December 19, 1963.

Examples of the documentary evidence available in support of the foregoing are: proposals to Drayton Mill from each of the vending companies; the chart prepared by Drayton's manager during the process of arriving at his decision; and the correspondence with the various bidding concerns.

As to Other Deering Milliken Mills: During the latter part of 1963, there were approximately 40 textile mills (including related companies) which sold their production through Deering Milliken. These include the mills acquired by Deering Milliken, Inc. from Textron, Inc. in the Spring of 1963. Of these, 27 were served by 10 different independent vending machine companies, of which Carolina Vend-A-Matic was one, serving 5 different plants. (Another vending machine company served 6 plants; the rest served less than 5.) It appears that of Carolina Vend-A-Matic's 5 contracts, 4 had been in existence since 1958. The remaining one was awarded in July 1963, on the basis of an invitation for proposals, followed by an award of the contract, as has been described above in the case of Drayton Mill. In this instance, however, the mill management decided on Carolina Vend-A-Matic (out of eight competitive proposals) as the preferable bidder. The contract was awarded accordingly. The plant in question has only about 250 employees.

Needless to say, there is not the slightest evidence that any Deering Milliken mill has ever cancelled a vending machine contract with the intention of transferring or "throwing" the contract to Carolina Vend-A-Matic, nor has any such mill ever done so. In short, the charge which union counsel says was anonymously relayed by telephone on November 17, 1963, to that effect is utterly without foundation.

We are, of course, in no position to deal with the allegations concerning Judge Haynsworth's ownership in Carolina Vend-A-Matic, or what the union portrays as a clumsy attempt to divest himself of any public connection with that company on the eve of the Darlington decision. It would, we feel, be both presumptuous and unnecessary for us to assay any defense of Judge Haynsworth against the irresponsible charges in the letter from Miss Eames. From the standpoint of Deering Milliken, Inc., however, as a party to the litigation in which the innuendoes have been raised, and a company which is implicitly if not primarily charged with bribing, or attempting to bribe, a member of the Federal Judiciary we can only voice the hope that if and when there should issue from the Court a vindication of Judge Haynsworth and a flat rejection of the union's suggestion that he should be disqualified from the Darlington decision, the Court's determination should make clear that Deering Milliken, Inc. is likewise free from any possible guilt in this situation.

In view of the length which this letter has already reached, we shall refrain from commenting on the peripheral charges by Miss Eames that are dealt with in Mr. Brooks' letter to the Court of January 16. Needless to say, we adopt Mr. Brooks' statement of the facts, so far as they are known to us.

We stand ready to meet with the Court, or to supply to the Court any information desired concerning any particulars of the matters under inquiry. We shall be happy to make Mr. Reiner, and his report, available to the Court; or if the Court wishes, either Mr. Schoemer or I will be glad to attend before it for further substantiation of these statements.

Respectfully,

STUART N. UPDIKE.

RICHMOND, VA.,
January 23, 1964.

Re *Darlington Mfg. Co., et al.* v. *NLRB.*

STUART N. UPDIKE, Esq.,
Townley, Updike, Carter & Rodgers,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. UPDIKE: Thank you for your letter of January 17. The court would like to be advised of the identity of the five plants referred to by you as being served by Carolina Vend-A-Matic, the dates on which such service began, the number of machines and the approximate volume of business transacted in each of these plants.

Sincerely,

SIMON E. SOBELOFF.

TOWNLEY, UPDIKE, CARTER & RODGERS,
New York, N.Y., January 27, 1964.

Re *Darlington Mfg. Co. et al.* v. *NLRB.*

Hon. SIMON E. SOBELOFF,
Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, Richmond, Va.

DEAR JUDGE SOBELOFF: I acknowledge with thanks your letter of January 23, 1964. I respond to your inquiry as follows:

THE FIVE PLANTS SERVED BY CAROLINA VEND-A-MATIC CO., INC.

At Marietta, South Carolina on the premises of Gayley Mill are located three separate operations. The first of these is the Gayley Mill itself; the other two are Clemson Industries and Mayco Yarns. Each of these is a separate manufacturing operation, although all three are located in the same plant premises at Gayley Mill. These operations constitute three of the total of five served by Carolina Vend-A-Matic Co., Inc. (hereafter "Carolina Vend-A-Matic"), as stated in my letter of January 17th.

The fourth plant is Jonesville Products, located at Jonesville, South Carolina. The fifth is Magnolia Finishing Plant, located at Blacksburg, South Carolina.

THE DATES ON WHICH SUCH SERVICE BEGAN

While the initial installation of two coffee machines by Carolina Vend-A-Matic at Gayley began in 1952, the more substantial operation as presently constituted began in March 1958. The servicing at Jonesville began in October 1958. The servicing at Magnolia began in August, 1963.

THE NUMBER OF MACHINES AND APPROXIMATE VOLUME

At Gayley there are six vending machines, as follows:

1 Coffee machine;
1 Cold Drink machine;
1 Candy machine;
1 Cigarette machine;
1 Hot Soup machine;
1 Sandwich machine.

The employees at Gayley Mill, Clemson Industries and Mayco Yarns are all served by the same machines. They total approximately 380 people. The average gross weekly sales is approximately $950.

At Jonesville Products there are two vending machines: 1 Coffee machine, 1 Candy machine. The plant employs approximately 50 people. The average gross weekly sales is approximately $24.

At Magnolia Finishing Plant there are *two* banks of machines, each consisting of eight vending machines, as follows:

1 Coffee machine;
1 Cold Drink Machine;
1 Candy machine;
1 Cigarette machine;
1 Sandwich machine;
1 Milk machine;
1 Ice Cream machine;
1 Pastry machine.

There are three other service areas in the plant, each with three vending machines, as follows:

1 coffee machine.
1 cold drink machine;
1 candy machine.

The Magnolia plant employs approximately 250 people. The average gross weekly sales is approximately $1,000.

For the convenience of the Court, we have prepared and enclose herewith a table setting forth the above information. As stated in concluding our letter of January 17th, we stand ready to meet the further requests of the Court.

Respectfully,

STUART N. UPDIKE.

CHART SHOWING DATES, NUMBER OF MACHINES, AND VOLUME BY PLANT

Plants	Date service began	Number of machines	Approximate volume: Number of employees	Approximate volume: Average weekly gross sales
Gayley M. Marietta, S.C. Clemson Industries, Marietta S.C. Mayco Yarns, Marietta, S.C.	March 1952 (coffee only) March 1958	6	380	$950
Jonesville Products Jonesville, S.C.	October 1958	2	50	24
Magnolia Finishing Plant, Blacksburg, S.C.	August 1963	8×2=16 3×3=9	250	1,000

TOWNLEY, UPDIKE, CARTER & RODGERS,
New York, N.Y., February 11, 1964.

Re Darlington Mfg. Co. et al v. NLRB.

Hon. SIMON E. SOBELOFF,
Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals,
Fourth Circuit,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR JUDGE SOBELOFF: In Mr. Updike's absence, I acknowledge receipt of a copy of Miss Eames' letter of February 6th to the Court.

As a comment by us or our client would seem to be superfluous under the circumstances, we shall await further instructions or advice from the Court.

Respectfully,

JOHN R. SCHOEMER, Jr.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
February 6, 1964.

Hon. SIMON E. SOBELOFF,
Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, Richmond, Va.

DEAR JUDGE SOBELOFF: Having read and reread Mr. Updike's letter to you of January 17, I believe that the facts therein set forth establish that Deering Milliken did not throw its vending machine contracts to Carolina Vend-A-Matic as was alleged to our Union on November 20. With that basic fact established, it becomes clear that my collateral concerns, as expressed to you in the last paragraph on the second page of my letter to you of December 17, become inappropriate.

I regret that Mr. Updike feels that my letter

to you was irresponsible. At the time when the telephoned message to our Union had been passed on to me, and I had noted the officerships in Carolina Vend-A-Matic and had heard what reports were available to me regarding Deering Milliken's southern plants, frankly I was sorely troubled as to what I *should* do about a half-knowledge which it would clearly be irresponsible to keep silent about. It appeared to me that the most responsible course was to write to the Chief Judge.

My letter to you has caused trouble. I am genuinely sorry for that. Since we now know that the allegation made to our Union was inaccurate, we know that that trouble was unnecessary. Thus I am the more regretful of the trouble caused.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICIA EAMES,
Assistant General Counsel.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS,
FOURTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
February 18, 1964.

Miss PATRICIA EAMES,
Assistant General Counsel,
Textile Workers Union of America,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MISS EAMES: Thank you for your letter of February 6. Your frank recognition that the statements made to you in the anonymous telephone call were in error, and that your acknowledgment that the concerns expressed by you on the basis of that call were unwarranted, should terminate this matter satisfactorily to all concerned.

For your further information, to complete the record, and in simple justice to Judge Haynsworth, I think I should inform you of some additional facts which our inquiry disclosed.

Information which the court has obtained from officials of Carolina Vend-A-Matic is entirely consistent with that which it has received through attorneys for Deering Milliken, copies of which were sent you. There was one slight discrepancy which calls for an explanatory word. Carolina Vend-A-Matic Co. had reported that it had vending machines in *three* identified plants related to Deering Milliken, Gayley Mill being one of them. Though Gayley Mill is one plant under one roof and there is only one vending installation there, Deering Milliken classed it as three operations; but they both meant the same thing.

Your anonymous informer said that Deering Milliken had cancelled all of its contracts with other vending machine companies and was throwing all of its many plants as vending machine locations to Carolina Vend-A-Matic. Some apparent corroboration of this might be inferred from the fact that a notice of a new vending operation had been posted at Drayton Mill.

Our inquiry produces no confirmation of the cancellation by Derring Milliken of any vendor's contract. A vending machine company had coffee vending machines in Drayton Mills, but all other food services were supplied by employees of the company operating "dope wagons." As Mr. Updike has reported, officials of Deering Milliken decided to replace the dope wagons with vending machines and sought proposals for complete vending from five companies, including the one which already had the coffee vending machines in the plant. Mr. Dennis and Mr. League, of Carolina Vend-A-Matic, conferred with Mr. Rogers of Drayton Mills on December 4, 1963, and, in response to his request on that date, submitted a proposal to him on December 9. Mr. Dennis, of Carolina Vend-A-Matic, received a letter from Mr. Foster, Personnel Manager of Drayton Mills, dated December 16, informing him that it had been decided to have Automatic Food Service, Inc. provide this service. Automatic Food Service, Inc. is the company which previously had the coffee machines in the plant.

As we also have learned, Carolina Vend-A-Matic was one of a number of vending machine companies which sought the business of the new Magnolia Finishing plant in 1963. On the basis of competitive bidding, Carolina Vend-A-Matic obtained that business. At about the same time, however, in the summer of 1963, it was one of several competitive bidders for the vending business of another Deering Milliken related plant, which, like Drayton Mills, was moving to complete food vending. It did not get that business. Thus, in 1963, Carolina Vend-A-Matic sought through competitive bidding the business of three Deering Milliken related plants, obtained that of one and lost that of the other two.

The actual facts do not warrant any inference that Deering Milliken related mills have preferred Carolina Vend-A-Matic in any way over other vendors.

The circumstances of Judge Haynsworth's resignation as a director of Carolina Vend-A-Matic are also well known to us, and it was prompted by a resolution of the Judicial Conference of the United States and was in no way related to Deering Milliken contracts.

When Judge Haynsworth came on this court in 1957, he was a member of the board of directors of a number of corporations. He resigned from the board of each of those corporations which was publicly owned. He did this in order to avoid any chance that someone might undertake to influence him indirectly through a corporation of which he was known to be a director. He did not resign from the boards of two corporations. One of those two is a small, passive corporation in which members of his family have an interest. It owns real estate under long term leases and engages in no active business. He also remained on the board of Carolina Vend-A-Matic, which is not publicly owned, for he thought that the considerations which led him to resign from the boards of the other corporations were inapplicable to it and the small, passive corporation.

Some months ago it became known that judges in other sections of the country were serving on the boards of large, active, publicly owned corporations. They had not done what Judge Haynsworth had done in the first instance. Their service on the boards of such corporations led to criticism, with the result that last fall the Judicial Conference of the United States adopted a resolution that

"No justice or judge of the United States shall serve in the capacity of an officer, director or employee of a corporation organized for profit."

In obedience to this resolution Judge Haynsworth severed official relations with Carolina Vend-A-Matic and the small, passive corporation. Judge Haynsworth's colleagues knew of these matters at the time and discussed them with him. Clearly his resignation has no sinister implication; it was a prompt, natural and expected response to the resolution adopted by the Judicial Conference.

Incidentally, we are assured that Judge Haynsworth has had no active participation in the affairs of Carolina Vend-A-Matic, has never sought business for it or discussed procurement of locations for it with the officials or employees of any other company.

It thus appears that the information received anonymously, by you was completely unfounded, and it is gratifying that after mature consideration you are convinced of this. However, unwarranted the allegation, since the propriety of the conduct of a member of this court has been questioned, I am today, at Judge Haynsworth's request and with the concurrence of the entire court, sending the file to the Department of Justice, together with an expression of our full confidence in Judge Haynsworth.

Sincerely,

SIMON E. SOBELOFF.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS,
FOURTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
February 18, 1964.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Enclosed is the file of correspondence passing between our court and counsel for the Textile Workers Union of America and Deering Milliken Corporation following the argument of an appeal in our court. Inasmuch as this relates to alleged conduct of one of our colleagues, we think it appropriate to pass the file on to the Department of Justice.

Happily, Miss Eames, who wrote the initial letter to the court on December 17, 1963, has herself acknowledged that the assertions and insinuations about Judge Haynsworth, made to her by some anonymous person in a telephone call, are without foundation; but I wish to add on behalf of the members of the court that our independent investigation has convinced us that there is no warrant whatever for these assertions and insinuations, and we express our compete confidence in Judge Haynsworth.

Sincerely,

SIMON E. SOBELOFF.

February 28, 1964.

Hon. SIMON E. SOBELOFF,
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. CHIEF JUDGE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated February 18, 1964, enclosing the file that reflects your investigation of certain assertions and insinuations about Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr.

Your thorough and complete investigation reflects that the charges were without foundation. I share your expression of complete confidence in Judge Haynsworth.

Thanks for bringing this matter to my attention.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ROUTING SLIP

To: John Duffener, Bldg. 4212.

JOHN: As I began at the beginning and read this—I thought—"Shades of Bobby Baker" with the vending machine aspects.

Having read it all I agree the matter has been fully and satisfactory by Judge Sobeloff.

A. GILCHEN.

FEBRUARY 26.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ROUTING SLIP

To Criminal Division.

Prepare reply for the signature of RFK.

CARL: I intend to prepare an acknowledgement from A. G. making reference to Sobeloff thorough & satisfactory handling of this allegation. Any comment?

———. ———.

FEBRUARY 26, 1964.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ROUTING SLIP

To: A. G.

O.K. to sign.

———. ———.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C., September 2, 1969.

Hon. JOHN N. MITCHELL,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Senate Judiciary Committee is scheduled to begin hearings soon on the President's nomination of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Shortly after the President submitted

Judge Haynsworth's name to the Senate, statements in the public press have charged that Judge Haynsworth should have disqualified himself from a labor case that was decided several years ago by the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

Because these same charges indicate that the Justice Department has a file on this matter, and because the Justice Department has been called upon in prior confirmation hearings to assist this Committee in analyses of legal points, I would very much appreciate having the views of the Department as to whether Judge Haynsworth should have disqualified himself in this case.

I would propose to share your reply with the Chairman and my fellow members of the Judiciary Committee.

Yours very truly,

ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., September 5, 1969.

Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: The Attorney General has asked me to reply to your letter to him dated September 2, requesting that the Justice Department comment on certain charges that have been made against Judge Clement F. Haynsworth. These charges, as I understand them, are that since Deering-Milliken, Inc., was a party to the case of *Darlington Mfg. Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board*, 325 F. 2d 682, decided by the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in 1963, and since Judge Haynsworth owned stock in a corporation which did business with Deering-Milliken, he had an "interest" in the *Darlington* case and should have disqualified himself from sitting. I understand from your letter that the Department's views will be circulated to the Chairman and other members of the Judiciary Committee, which will shortly consider the President's nomination of Judge Haynsworth to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

We have received from Judge Haynsworth a copy of a statement which he has prepared in response to a request from Senator Eastland, the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and have used that statement, together with the file forwarded to the Justice Department in 1964 by Chief Judge Sobeloff,[1] as the factual basis for our reply to your question.

The *Darlington* case was orally argued before the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit on June 13, 1963, and was decided by that court on November 15, 1963.[2] Judge Haynsworth had been appointed to the Court of Appeals six years earlier, in 1957. During all of the time that the *Darlington* case was pending before the Court of Appeals in 1963, Judge Haynsworth held one-seventh of the stock of a South Carolina corporation known as Carolina Vend-A-Matic Company, which he had helped organize in 1950.

During 1963 Vend-A-Matic obtained slightly more than three percent of its gross sales from various plants of the Deering-Milliken combine, plants in which some 700 out of a total of 19,000 Deering-Milliken employees worked. Deering-Milliken granted space to vending machine companies on the basis of competitive bidding. During 1963 Vend-A-Matic competed for three such awards, obtaining one and losing two. None of the Deering-Milliken officials who awarded vending machine rights knew that Judge Haynsworth was associated with Vend-A-Matic. Judge Haynsworth in turn played no part at any time in Vend-A-Matic's site acquisition program, and was largely unfamiliar with information regarding its site locations at the time the *Darlington* case was before his Court.

Prior to 1957 Judge Haynsworth took some part in obtaining financing for Vend-A-Matic; after his appointment to the Court of Appeals, he took no active part in the business at all. Prior to his appointment to the Court of Appeals, he was both a director and a Vice President of Vend-A-Matic; he orally resigned as Vice President in 1957, although the minute book of the corporation continued to show him as holding that office in subsequent years. He continued as a director until October, 1963, when he resigned in compliance with a resolution of the United States Judicial Conference adopted shortly before that date.

I regard the dates of resignation by Judge Haynsworth as an officer and director of Vend-A-Matic as immaterial for purposes of this analysis. Since he remained a holder of stock in the company of substantial value after he had resigned his official positions, he was in spite of these resignations unquestionably "interested" in Vend-A-Matic. Since he was not active in the conduct of its business, and was unfamiliar with the details of the location of its machines, the fact that he was a director does not change the situation from what it would have been had he been simply a stockholder. The legal and ethical question raised by these facts is whether a judge, who owns stock in one corporation, which in turn does business with a second corporation, should disqualify himself when the second corporation is a party litigant in his court.

Those statutes and canons of ethics which regulate judicial conduct are basically of two kinds: those which govern the *extra-judicial* activities of a judge, and those which govern his *judicial* activity.

18 U.S.C. 205 prohibits judges from acting as attorneys or agents for any party in a proceeding to which the United States is a party; 28 U.S.C. 454 prohibits the practice of law by a judge appointed under the authority of the United States; several of the canons of judicial ethics likewise restrict the sort of extra-judicial conduct in which a judge may engage. The recent action of the Judicial Conference of the United States, requiring that permission of the Conference be obtained for judges to engage in extra-judicial employment, and that judges report to the Conference outside income from personal services, was addressed to extra-judicial conduct. The charges made against Judge Haynsworth, on the other hand, are directed to the second kind of judicial conduct which is regulated by statute and by canons of judicial ethics—the conduct of the judge in the discharge of his *judicial* duties.

Both a statute and one of the Canons of Judicial Ethics are relevant in assessing these charges.[3] 28 U.S.C. 455 provides that:

"Any justice or judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any case in which he has a substantial interest, has been of counsel, is or has been a material witness, or is so related to or connected with any party or his attorney as to render it improper, in his opinion, for him to sit on the trial, appeal, or other proceedings therein."

Canon 29 states:

"A judge should abstain from performing or taking part in any judicial act in which his personal interests are involved. If he has personal litigation in the court of which he is a judge, he need not resign his judgeship on that account, but he should, of course, refrain from any judicial act in such a controversy."

Though this Canon has been mentioned in connection with the charges made against Judge Haynsworth, I do not believe that it is applicable. None of the information about the Vend-A-Matic suggests that it was an enterprise ". . . apt to be involved in litigation in the courts", and it was not in fact involved in the *Darlington* case.

In addition to the federal disqualification statute, numerous states have disqualification statutes cast in somewhat similar terms, and precedents from those jurisdictions are helpful in the absence of authoritative decisions construing the federal statute. Under the statute, the question is quite clearly whether Judge Haynsworth had a "substantial" interest in the *Darlington* case; under Canon 29, the question is whether Judge Haynsworth's "personal interests" were involved in that litigation.

Quite obviously, when we are dealing with a concept which has both a legal and an ethical content, it is not desirable to parse the language in a manner which might sacrifice ethical substance to legal form. At first blush, indeed, it might appear to be an easy solution to the question of disqualification for the judge to "bend over backwards" and recuse himself if there be even the most tenuous claim that he ought to do so. More careful consideration, I believe, suggests that this is not the case, and requires that a quite precise determination be made in each case on the basis of the statute, the canons and the facts. This is because of the generally accepted principle stated as follows by two different federal courts of appeals:

"There is as much obligation upon a judge not to recuse himself when there is no occasion as there is for him to do so when there is." In re *Union Leader Corp.*, 1st Cir., 292 F. 2d 381, 391 (1961), quoted with approval in *Wolfson* v. *Palmieri*, 2nd Cir., 396 F. 2d 121 (1968).

The delays and procedural snarls which not infrequently result from the disqualification of a trial judge are serious enough to suggest that such action should be resorted to only when justified. Additional complications occur when the judge recusing himself sits on an appellate court, since there is not the freedom to transfer a case from one appellate court to another as there is from one trial judge to another. John P. Frank, in an article entitled, "Disqualification of Judges", 56 Yale Law Journal 605 (1947), points out that from 1941 to 1946 three cases pending before the Supreme Court of the United States had to be either dismissed for lack of a quorum, *Chrysler Corporation* v. *United States*, 314 U.S. 483 (1941), continued for lack of a quorum, *North American Company* v. *Securities & Exchange Commission*, 327 U.S. 686 (1946), or transferred for final decision to a court of appeals pursuant to special statute, *United States* v. *Aluminum Company of America*, 322 U.S. 716 (1944). On more than one occasion since the date of that article, the Supreme Court of the United States has been obliged to affirm the judgment of the lower court by an equally divided vote and without opinion, because of disqualification. *Bailey* v. *Richardson*, 341 U.S. 918 (1951); *Alitalia-Linee Aeree Italiane*, S.p.A. v. *Lisi*, 390 U.S. 455 (1968); *Anderson* v. *Johnson*, 390 U.S. 456 (1968); *World Airways, Inc. v. Pan American World Airways, Inc.*, 391 U.S. 461 (1968). One of the leading antitrust cases of the 1950s, *United States* v. *E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 353 U.S. 586 (1957), was decided by a Court consisting of only six

---

[1] The file compiled by Chief Judge Sobeloff was the result of an investigation by the Court itself into a similar, though not identical, accusation against Judge Haynsworth. I have assumed from your letter that you wished to have the views of the Department without regard to the findings of the Court, and this letter has been prepared accordingly.

[2] Though not strictly relevant to your inquiry, an accurate procedural description of this litigation is attached to this letter with the thought that it may be of interest to you and to other Committee members.

[3] Canon 26, ABA Canons of Judicial Ethics, states:

"A judge should abstain from making personal investments in enterprises which are apt to be involved in litigation in the courts; and, after his accession to the bench, he should not retain such investment previously made, longer than a period sufficient to enable him to dispose of them without serious loss."

justices, who divided 4 to 2 on the issue before them.

While disqualifications in the courts of appeals do not have the same significance with respect to final decision of important points of law as do disqualifications in the Supreme Court of the United States, they nonetheless create more akwardness than do disqualifications at the trial court level. Indeed, a serious procedural snarl would have resulted in the *Darlington* case had one of the five judges of the Court of Appeals disqualified himself. Had Judge Haynsworth disqualified himself, the Court would presumably have been evenly divided, Judges Bryan and Boreman voting to set aside the Board's order, Chief Judge Sobeloff and Judge Bell voting to enforce the order. While in the case of a direct appeal of a judgment of a district court, the result of such a division is affirmance, it is by no means clear that this would be the result in an agency proceeding where both the agency and the respondent are petitioning the appellate court for relief.

Disqualification where required by statute or by the Canons of Ethics is a judge's undoubted duty. But the disruptive consequences of disqualification, which may be readily borne in order to insure fairness where the judge does have a "substantial interest" in the litigation, should not be borne in order to gratify the desire on the part of either a litigant or of the judge himself that the judge not sit when he does not have such a substantial interest.

There is thus no escape from a careful analysis of each fact situation. The "substantial interest" referred to in the statute and the "personal interest" referred to in the canon is a pecuniary, material interest in the outcome of the litigation. The clearest case is one in which the judge is a party to the lawsuit; obviously he may not sit in such a case. Little different is the case in which the judge owns a significant amount of stock in a corporation which is a party to a lawsuit before him; he, too, must rescue himself. Parties to lawsuits either win or lose them, in whole or in part, and it is difficult to conceive of a lawsuit in which a party, or the stockholder of a corporate party, does not have a material, pecuniary interest in the way in which the lawsuit is decided.

These clear cases quite obviously do not decide the question relating to Judge Haynsworth in the *Darlington* case. Vend-A-Matic had some business dealings with Deering-Milliken, but it was in no sense a party to the Darlington litigation. One question is presented when a judge holds stock in a corporation which is a party to litigation before him. A quite different question is posed when the judge merely owns stock in a corporation which "does business" with a party to litigation before him. A general rule of disqualification in the second situation is neither administratively workable nor ethically desirable. The judge who owns stock in American Telephone and Telegraph Company must simply seek other employment if such a rule be applied, since that corporation presumably does business with virtually every party to every lawsuit in the nation. On a smaller scale, the same would be true of a judge owning stock in a local public utility. Yet surely no one would seriously contend that a judge, by reason of his stockholding in such corporations, would be influenced in favor of parties who were their customers.

A slightly different case is that of a judge who owns stock in a local bank, which in turn has loans outstanding to various individuals and businesses in the community. Where a solvent debtor of the bank is a party to a lawsuit, the interests of the bank in seeing its debtor prevail in order to increase the probabilities of repayment of its loan is theoretically present, but is remote indeed. On the other hand, a judge owning a significant amount of stock in a bank which in turn has a large unsecured loan outstanding to Company X, a company in financial difficulties, should disqualify himself in a treble damage action brought by Company X against a thoroughly solvent defendant.

It therefore seems clear that no categorical rule may be laid down in the case of a judge owning stock in a corporation which does business with a party litigant in the judge's court. Not only is disqualification in all such cases not required ethically, but the adoption of such a principle would make it impossible in many cases to even assemble the facts necessary to pass on a question of disqualification. A corporation need not be listed in Poor's in order to have a number of customers buying from it, and a number of sellers selling to it. The great majority of each are likely to be unknown to a stockholder who takes no active part in the conduct of the corporation's business.

Instead of a broad rule of disqualification in such cases, the principle behind the provision for disqualification suggests that the facts of each case must be analyzed in order to see whether the judge can fairly be said to have a "substantial interest" in the litigaton. It is clear from the examples cited that the characterization of a corporation as "doing business" with a party litigant is far too imprecise to enable one to determine whether the corporation has a "substantial interest" in the litigation. The type and amount of business done, and the effect that various alternative outcomes of the litigation would have on the corporation which is "doing" the "business" must all be considered. A corporation, and therefore those owning substantial stock in the corporation, would seem to have a "substantial interest" in the litigation if it would be probably affected in some defineable, material way by one outcome of the litigation as opposed to another.

Applying this test to Judge Haynsworth's position in the *Darlington* case, I am inescapably led to the conclusion that he should not have disqualified himself. Vend-A-Matic was one of many suppliers of food services to the various Deering-Milliken plants, and Deering-Milliken was one of many owners of installations in which Vend-A-Matic food dispensing machines were placed. It is clear from the facts presented that the Deering-Milliken officials who dealt with vending machine suppliers had no idea that Judge Haynsworth had any connection with any of these companies. As a matter of common sense, as well as of law, it is not possible to identify any conceivable effect that a decision one way or another in the *Darlington* case would have had on the fortunes of Vend-A-Matic.

The opinions of the American Bar Association Committee on Professional Ethics and the decisions of state and federal courts confirm our conclusion that Judge Haynsworth acted properly; disqualification has not been regarded as proper in circumstances such as those surrounding the *Darlington* decision.

In attempting to delineate the scope of the "substantial interest" referred to in the statute and the "personal interest" referred to in the Canon, virtually all of the decisions speak in terms of a "direct" or "immediate" interest as opposed to a "remote" or contingent" interest in the outcome of the litigation. A New York appellate court made this statement in connection with the general problem:

"The interest which will disqualify a judge to sit in a cause need not be large, but it must be real. It must be certain, and not merely possible or contingent; it must be one which is visible, demonstrable, and capable of precise proof." *People* v. *Whitridge,* 129 N.Y. Supp. 300, 304 (App. Div. 1911).

Similarly, The American Bar Association Committee on Professional Ethics decided in Formal Opinion 170 (1937) that a judge should disqualify himself from a case if he owned stock in a corporation that was a party to the litigation. In response to a questionnaire, virtually all state and federal appellate judges indicated that their practice was in conformity with the opinion of the ABA. Frank, op. cit.

At the other extreme, judges, recognizing their duty to sit, have properly refused to disqualify themselves when their interest was remote and insubstantial. For example, it has been held that disqualification was not required under the federal statute when the judge's stockholding in one of the litigants was a minuscule fraction of the issued and outstanding stock. *Lampert* v. *Hollis Music, Inc.,* 105 F.Supp. 3(E.D.N.Y. 1952).

Attempts to extend disqualification to cases where a judge holds stock, not in a party litigant, but in a corporation which had some sort of dealings with a party litigant, have been rebuffed by courts except under unusual circumstances where that interest was not remote. Several cases have arisen in which a judge owned stock in a creditor of one of the parties to the litigation before him, and his disqualification was sought, presumably on the theory that the creditor necessarily had a pecuniary interest in seeing its debtor prevail in litigation with a third party. The decided cases have without exception rejected this contention. *Webb* v. *Town of Eutaw,* 63 So. 687 (Ala. 1913); In re *Farber,* 260 Mich. 652, 245 N.W. 793 (1932).

Related efforts to expand disqualification beyond stockholding in an actual party litigant have met with no success. In *Board of Education of City of Detroit* v. *Getz,* 321 Mich. 676, 33 N.W. 2d 113 (1948), the court held that the fact that the judge was a member of the faculty of the institution for which land was being sought by condemnation did not disqualify him. The Supreme Court of Texas held that ownership of stock by a judge's brother-in-law in a corporation which was a party to the litigation was not grounds for disqualification. Texas Farm *Bureau Cotton Ass'n* v. *Williams,* 300 S.W. 44 (Tex. 1927). The fact that a judge is a taxpayer of a municipality does not disqualify him to hear the municipality's claim of ownership to certain lands, *City of Oakland* v. *Oakland Waterfront Co.,* 50 Pac. 268 (Calif. 1897), or an action brought against the city for some other sort of relief, *Prawdzik* v. *City of Grand Rapids,* 313 Mich. 376, 21 N.W. 2d 168 (1946).

The Supreme Court of California rejected an attempted disqualification even though the judge had a definite, if indirect, interest in the pending litigation. The judge there owned stock in a title insurance company which had insured the title of many trust beneficiaries whose interests would fail in the event that the plaintiff in litigation before the judge was successful. *Central Savings Bank of Oakland* v. *Lake,* 257 Pac. 521 (Calif. 1927).

I have found only two cases in which the courts required disqualification even though the judge did not own stock directly in the party litigant. *In re Honolulu Consol. Oil Co.,* 9th Cir., 243 F. 348 (1917), the sitting trial judge had earlier disposed of stock in corporations which had been named defendants in other actions brought by the United States to quiet title to certain oil lands.

The pending action was similar to the other actions, all of them being part of a "unitary plan" on the part of the United States to bring such actions against all California Oil Companies. The issue of damage was identical in all, and the litigation before the judge could have served as a precedent for the remaining ones. Under California law, as it then existed, stockholders remained personally liable for corporate debts even after their stock had been sold. The Court of Appeals held that under these circum-

stances the judge was disqualified. In *City of Vallejo* v. *Superior Court*, 249 Pac. 1084 (1926), it was held that a judge who was a stockholder in a bank which in turn held the mortgage on property that was the subject of a pending condemnation action in his court was disqualified, even though the bank was not technically a party to the action. It is apparent from the facts of these cases that they have no bearing on Judge Haynsworth's situation in the *Darlington* case.

There is no doubt in my mind that these precedents support the conclusion, equally readily reached on common sense ethical considerations, that Judge Haynsworth ought not to have disqualified himself in the *Darlington* case. While the spirit as well as the letter of the statute and canons must be faithfully applied, questions of disqualification are to be decided in exactly the same manner as a judge decides substantive legal questions which regularly come before him. He must exercise a careful and informed judgment leading him to disqualify himself in those cases in which he has a "substantial interest", and to sit in those cases in which he does not. I am satisfied that Judge Haynsworth adhered to this standard.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST,
Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel.

DARLINGTON VERSUS *NLRB*: SEQUENCE OF PROCEEDINGS

The case arose out of the action of Darlington Manufacturing Company in closing and liquidating its only plant following the victory of the Textile Workers Union of America in a representation election at that plant in 1956. The Board found that both Darlington and Deering-Milliken, Inc., which owned some 40 percent of Darlington's stock, were thereby guilty of an unfair labor practice, and directed that Darlington's employees receive back pay or preferential hiring at other Deering-Milliken mills.

The Court of Appeals, in an opinion by Judge Bryan, refused to enforce the order of the Board, holding that Darlington had an unqualified right to shut down its only plant, regardless of its motive in so doing. The Court further held that even if the Darlington plant be treated as a part of the Deering-Milliken operation, the order nonetheless could not be enforced because an employer had a right to shut down a portion of his business for whatever reason he chose. Judges Haynsworth and Boreman concurred in Judge Bryan's opinion. Chief Judge Sobeloff concurred in a dissenting opinion written by Judge Bell.

Both the union and the Board successfully sought certiorari from the Supreme Court of the United States, which vacated the judgment of the Court of Appeals in *Textile Workers* v. *Darlington Co.*, 380 U.S. 263 (1965). The Supreme Court agreed with the position of the majority of the Fourth Circuit that an employer had a right to completely cease business even if motivated by anti-union animus in so doing, but held that an unfair labor practice could be found to exist if Darlington were regarded "as an integral part of the Deering-Milliken enterprise". The Supreme Court went on to hold that the Board's findings were insufficient to support such a conclusion, and sent the matter back to the Board for further findings.

The Board proceeded to find all of the necessary elements to support the sort of unfair labor practice that the Supreme Court had held could be found under the circumstances, and again sought enforcement of its order in the Court of Appeals. The case was again heard *en banc* by the court. This time a majority of the court, in an opinion written by Judge Butzner, directed that the Board's order be enforced. Judges Bryan and Boreman dissented, but Judge Haynsworth concurred specially with the majority.

VIETNAM POLICY: STALLED ON BOTH TRACKS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the blunt fact facing the President and the Nation is that the administration's "two track" Vietnam policy—negotiations in Paris and political evolution in Saigon—is badly stalled on both tracks; and that renewed progress on both tracks is both necessary and possible. I come away with this view after detailed discussions I had with Ambassador Lodge and his principal assistants in Paris less than 2 weeks ago, detailing the absence of any meaningful progress in the negotiations there. This has convinced me of the urgent need for a rethinking of the U.S. negotiating position in Paris—one of our tracks—and for shedding the optimism which still seems to be entertained in high quarters concerning the progress that could be made in Paris under present policy assumptions and objectives, which are largely inherited from the Johnson administration.

The "two track" policy of the Nixon administration is conceptually creative and I have expressed my support of this approach. But it has always necessarily been based on a policy of phased U.S. troop withdrawal.

It is vital that the President recapture the momentum of his earlier announcements. He can do this by setting a timetable for the withdrawal of 200,000 more U.S. troops by the end of 1970.

The overriding objective of a withdrawal policy should be to place the combat responsibility where it now clearly belongs—with the South Vietnamese. Uncertainty as to whether North Vietnam has reduced its forces in a reciprocal way must not be allowed to obstruct or vitiate the process of phasing U.S. forces out of the main combat role in a reasonable and orderly way.

The President's decision to suspend further troop withdrawals at this time has created a sense of uneasiness in many quarters which could lead to a serious erosion of public confidence in the way the administration is seeking to end the Vietnam war.

The failure of the North Vietnamese and NLF negotiators to respond meaningfully to U.S. offers, which our officials believe to be real overtures toward giving them an opportunity to participate in the Government of South Vietnam, has caused some understandable feelings of frustration and bitterness within the administration. Natural as these emotions may seem under the circumstances, they are no substitute for policy. And, there is renewed danger that U.S. Vietnam policy will again fall captive to the false optimism and lack of realism which continues to pervade the thinking of some top U.S. officials in Vietnam, both civilian and military.

Perhaps drawing sustenance from the perennial overoptimism of U.S. military commanders in Vietnam—for whom "victory" seems always just around the corner—President Thieu has precipitated a political showdown with the Nixon administration on the question of the composition of his government. It is essential that the United States respond. A timetable for the withdrawal of 200,000 troops is a necessary element of the U.S. response, in my judgment.

For many months, the Nixon administration has been urging President Thieu to broaden the base of his government by including civilian leaders who could help it compete politically with the Communists in an open election. President Nixon himself is reported to have raised the matter twice with President Thieu, first at the Midway Conference on June 8 and again in Saigon on July 30.

However, as reported in the New York Times:

> When the long-awaited new Cabinet was finally unveiled last week, even the boundlessly optimistic United States Mission here was hardpressed to conceal its disappointment . . . For, rather than broaden the political base of his Government, President Thieu effectively narrowed it . . . Not a single political leader of any consequence is included in the new group, nor is there any representative of the responsible, non-Communist opposition in the South.

The conclusions drawn by the New York Times report are far from reassuring. The reported stated:

> The effect of this seemingly self-defeating, exercise was to raise serious doubts about President Thieu's motives. . . . he evidently felt free to disregard the American desires for more political participation in the Government, apparently confident that he would incur only mild criticism from the embassy here. As it turned out, he incurred none at all.

The "moment of truth" with the Saigon government cannot be postponed much longer; for, it is clear that President Thieu and his military associates regard as in their highest self-interest a continuation of the status quo in South Vietnam. The stark implications of this status quo are unacceptable, I believe, to the American people. The Thieu government is seemingly committed to the political repression of all possible rival non-Communist political groups; to pressing offensive combat operations against the Communist forces by a large U.S. expeditionary force as well as by the ARVN; and to the maintenance of large ARVN forces equipped and subsidized by the United States—but with a major function to provide political and administrative support for the Saigon government.

Only when it is unmistakably clear to the Saigon government—and to the U.S. officials in Saigon—that the United States will no longer support the status quo, can there be any expectation of the kind of political evolution which may assure the survival of an independent government in South Vietnam. A timetable for the withdrawal of 200,000 U.S. troops could provide the needed catalyst.

The question of the orderly phasing out of major numbers of U.S. troops from combat also poses an important issue for the U.S. military command. In the great U.S. tradition of civilian paramountcy in the control of the Armed Forces, it is now their duty to tell the country how best, most securely and most efficiently to withdraw these forces. And, how best to use the forces which remain, as well as how to phase them out in their turn. Also, how best to aid South Vietnam consistently with these policy decisions on troop withdrawal.

The United States has accomplished its one legitimate mission in Vietnam. It has prevented the military conquest of the South by the armed forces of the North. We have no commitment to "make it good" for the Saigon government in any political settlement or contest which follows the end of the U.S. combat involvement.

Fortuitously, the inescapable "moment of truth" with Saigon has coincided with the death of Ho Chi Minh. Undoubtedly, Ho's death marks the end of an era in Vietnamese affairs. It is an event which makes it particularly timely for the United States to place its relationship with the Saigon government on a new footing and to regain control over our policies and level of involvement.

In my judgment, President Nixon should endeavor to extend the present cease-fire initiated by North Vietnam in connection with Ho Chi Minh's funeral into a permanent, inplace cease-fire.

It is significant that opposition to a cease-fire on our side is centered in the Thieu government and in the U.S. military command in Saigon. Cheered on by the GVN and ARVN commanders, our military commanders—with irrepressible optimism—seem again to have convinced themselves that the Communist forces are about to collapse and that "victory"—once again—is just around the corner. Consequently, they oppose a cease-fire on the grounds that it would concede too much residual political influence and territorial control to Communist forces within alleged cease-fire "sanctuaries." The Saigon government, and our military people, believe that "keeping up the pressure" will reduce and finally eliminate all areas of Communist strength and influence.

It is the same "threshold of victory" which General Westmoreland assured us we had attained just before the Tet offensive in February 1968.

There has been no progress whatsoever at the Paris peace talks, at least since the departure from Paris last July of Le Duc Tho, an important North Vietnamese figure in his own right. In retrospect it now appears to be possible that Duc Tho's return to Hanoi—and the ensuing freeze in the Paris talks—may have been related to the imminent death of Ho Chi Minh. It is plausible, if not probable, that Ho's death was a prolonged deathbed vigil during which no innovations in North Vietnamese policy was possible. If this proves to have been the case, renewed progress may again be possible when the new lines of political authority have been sorted out in Hanoi.

In addition to these moves, the United States should make a major effort to induce Hanoi to take a more humanitarian and forthcoming position with regard to U.S. prisoners of war. This is a task in which our traditional friends in Europe and elsewhere can play an important role. Their support of the United States with respect to the prisoners of war could mark a new rapprochement since the freeze of the Vietnam war beginning in 1965. If Hanoi would provide a list of prisoners it holds, and indicate a program for their release and repatriation, suspicion of Hanoi's motives in this country would be significantly allayed. This would make it easier for President Nixon to provide more flexible and accommodating negotiating instructions to Ambassador Lodge.

The alternatives to further administration efforts to break the stalemate on both tracks of the two-track approach are ominous indeed. In the United States tensions are bound to increase dramatically if antiwar activists again take to the streets and campuses and if public confidence in the capacity of the Nixon administration to carry out its overwhelming electoral mandate of 1968—an end to the Vietnam war—wanes.

For President Thieu and other non-Communists in South Vietnam, the prospects are equally ominous. Continued bickering and jockeying among the disparate non-Communist groups, and continued foot dragging by the Thieu government in the all-important task of seeking to create a broadbased non-Communist coalition, would leave the non-Communist majority of South Vietnam totally unprepared for the day when most U.S. troops have been withdrawn from combat. Only such a coalition could provide a viable political alternative in open competition with the NLF.

Accordingly, the Thieu government especially, but also all the other non-Communists in South Vietnam, should be given unmistakable notice that 200,000 U.S. troops will be withdrawn according to a timetable by the end of 1970. If this does not galvanize the South Vietnamese into political reform and rapprochement, then it will be clear that our policy of seeking a viable non-Communist government in South Vietnam was never based on a sense of realism. Under these circumstances the only course for the United States to follow will be the phasing out of our remaining forces.

However, if—as we all hope—the South Vietnamese can be shaken out of their torpor and inertia to demonstrate a capacity to be master of their own destiny the United States can provide continued support and assistance. But the day is past when the United States can be more concerned—and make more sacrifices in blood and treasure—for the well being and survival of our Vietnamese allies than they are doing for themselves.

DISTRICT PLAN FAVORED FOR ELECTORAL REFORM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, inasmuch as the House of Representatives is about to begin discussion and action on the comprehensive and controversial question of electoral college reform, it seems appropriate to call attention of the Congress and the country to a highly informative article on this subject appearing in last night's Evening Star. I ask therefore, that at the end of these remarks, this article by James J. Kilpatrick be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I think most of us agree that electoral college reform is desirable but I wonder how many Members of Congress have fully considered the far-flung ramifications of the "meat-ax proposal" now before the House whereby through one big, unprecedented legislative action they propose by constitutional amendment to eliminate entirely our traditional electoral college procedures and provide instead the direct vote for President of the United States. Clearly, this is employing a pickax to do the work required by a scalpel. What is today required is a correction of certain demonstrable inequities in our electoral college system rather than a major operation attacking the very foundations of our great American Federal system of Government.

Before Americans commit themselves to undertake such a irrevocable experiment as abolishing our electoral college and thereby drastically destroying for more than half our States their present influence and authority in nominating and electing Presidents of the United States there are many questions citizens should ask and answer for themselves. Among them are the following:

First. Is it desirable to turn over to the Central Government in Washington the full authority to regulate and control the elections in our several States? At present, the States themselves prescribe the age levels for voting, the hours that the polls shall be open, the manner in which absentee votes shall be cast, the residence requirements essential for newcomers in a State to have the right to vote—and all other such considerations. Should the direct, popular vote for President be adopted as a substitute for our present electoral procedures, all of these determinations would immediately and necessarily be transferred to some authority in the Federal Government?

Second. Should sheer weight of population be the only factor to be considered in determining where and how a President is to be selected and elected and who among us is to be realistically eligible to become President of the United States? As of today, small- and medium-sized States command at least some attention since they get the advantage of a great "dividend from federalism" in that each State gets two electoral votes because it is entitled to two Members of the U.S. Senate. To force well over half our States to lose this advantage of federalism; to reduce for them substantially their influence over national policies and the determination of who shall be President would be to surrender to the "sheer weight of population" the most important choice we get to make as free men and women—the election of our President.

Third. The proposal for a direct vote for President as before the House provides a formula for the regular election of "minority Presidents" since it would declare elected any candidate receiving as little as 40 percent of the popular vote. In this connection another very serious, expensive, and disruptive situation is created since the House direct election proposal provides that there should be a national runoff election for President whenever any candidate receives less than 40 percent of the popular vote. Since the direct popular vote process for electing a President is certain to have the effect of stimulating the proliferation of splinter parties of all types in this country because each candidate will

have his votes reported for national publicity on election night, the probability of runoff elections being necessary will grow greater with each presidential election. Consequently, serious-minded Americans should reflect upon the tremendous financial and physical costs of a second presidential election as well as the disruptive and disquieting impact upon our National well-being of a second, heated presidential race so soon following the earlier, indecisive contest.

With elections coming on the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November, each 4 years, serious consideration should also be given to the time element involved as we approach our annual holiday seasons. It is only reasonable to allow 2 or 3 weeks between the presidential election and the probable runoff second election. That would carry us into late November as time must be allowed for weary candidates to get some rest, to arrange for the refinancing of national campaigns, and for the realinement of competing forces once all third party and splinter party candidates are out of the running. At best 3 weeks should be allowed for the runoff presidential election unless it is expected presidential candidates will ignore entirely all of rural America and all our smaller States to concentrate on getting the biggest possible majorities in our vast centers of population. Holding a presidential runoff election during the Christmas holidays or in the later winter months of November and December in many of our Northern States is a near impossibility as it is to hold them during the busy, pre-Christmas days of shopping, family reunions, and general holiday observances.

Mr. President, there are many other serious repercussions flowing from the hastily devised and considered proposal to drop our electoral college system which has served this Federal Republic so long and so well and substituting a direct-vote popular election concept. This Senator and others will discuss them later but in the meantime it is hoped the House of Representatives will go into these matters carefully and either reject the direct-vote experiment entirely or substitute for it the so-called district plan—Senate Joint Resolution 12—which will correct the deficiencies of the present electoral college system without abandoning our whole concept of federalism and altering the historic relationsip which has always existed between our several States and the Central Government.

Mr. President, I now read into the RECORD the article on electoral reform written by James J. Kilpatrick:

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 9, 1969]

DISTRICT PLAN FAVORED FOR ELECTORAL REFORM

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The House of Representatives this week will debate the most important proposal for constitutional amendment, in terms of the structure of our government, since the Constitution itself was adopted in 1788.

The pending resolution calls for direct popular election of our Presidents. In my own view, the proposal is wrong. It ought to be defeated in favor of a less drastic plan that will accomplish all needed reforms. The better plan is the "district plan."

Under the proposal recommended by a divided Judiciary Committee, the Congress effectively would take over the management of presidential elections. The States could still fix an age limitation for their voters—that is the presumption, anyhow—but all other regulations would be subject to federal law.

The idea is that Congress would provide for the qualification of presidential candidates, for the make-up of ballots, for the holding of a national election, for a run-off if none of the candidates received 40 percent. Congress presumably would provide for vote challenges, recounts, and all other aspects of the elections. Every vestige of the present electoral system would be wiped out.

These are drastic changes. The proposal, if adopted, would tend to convert this Republic from a union of States into a consolidated form of democracy. Overnight, we would abandon our structure of federalism in one of its most important manifestations—the election of a President. It is a fundamental change that the House has before it.

No such upheaval is required. The great George Wallace scare of 1968 arose from the possibility that the Alabaman might prevent either Nixon or Humphrey from obtaining a clear majority of the 538 electoral votes. If this had developed, the election might have gone to the House, or Wallace might have traded off his electors in some fashion, and the country would have faced a constitutional crisis.

None of this happened, of course; no such dreadful prospects have materialized since 1828; but the apprehensions are valid. Besides, there are other things wrong with the present system of independent presidential electors, chosen in each State on a basis of winner-take-all. The system cries out for reform.

But reform is one thing, and fundamental change is quite another. The House ought to ask: Is there a way of achieving the reforms without such radical surgery? The answer is plainly, yes. In the district plan, or in the similar "proportional" plan, every procedural objective sought by critics of the present scheme could be attained. Either of the two plans would (1) abolish independent electors, (2) abolish the last resort of one State, one vote, in the House, and (3) end the evil of winner-take-all.

Under the district plan, a presidential candidate would win one electoral vote for each congressional district he carried, plus two for each State he carried. We can see how the plan would operate by looking back to 1964. Johnson polled 948,000 votes in Florida. He carried the State, and claimed all of its 14 electoral votes. Goldwater got nothing for the 906,000 votes he received, or for the seven congressional districts he carried. Under the district plan, Florida's electoral vote would have been divided 7–7. In the same election, Louisiana's 10 electoral votes went wholly to Goldwater. Under the district plan, Johnson would have won three votes for the districts he carried.

The district plan represents the least change from the federalism that has served us well. It would apply to the presidency the same basic plan used to elect the Congress. It would avoid the philosophical swamps and the cumbersome obstacles of "national democracy." It is fair and workable, and it has this further political advantage: It is far more likely to be ratified by three-fourths of the State legislatures than a radical plan for direct election.

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. JAMES L. RICHARDSON TO GRADUATING CLASS, CALIFORNIA MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, Lt. Gen. James L. Richardson, Jr., retired, recently addressed the graduating class of the California Military Academy. During his long and distinguished military career General Richardson ably commanded the Sunburst Division—40th—of the California Army National Guard when that unit was called into service during the Korean conflict. After a series of well-deserved promotions, and new and challenging assignments, General Richardson assumed command of the Sixth U.S. Army, with headquarters at the Presidio of San Francisco. Though now retired from the Army, General Richardson maintains an active interest in military affairs and particularly the California units he commanded with such distinction. His remarks to the graduates of the California Military Academy, are timely and valuable and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF LT. GEN. JAMES L. RICHARDSON, THE CALIFORNIA MILITARY ACADEMY GRADUATING CLASS, SAN LUIS OBISPO, AUGUST 23, 1969

General Ames, Mr. Meese, Col. Nimm, distinguished guests, members of the California Military Academy graduating class, ladies and gentlemen.

This graduation is such an important occasion in the lives of so many, that I feel very privileged and honored to be permitted to share the day with you. Thank you so very much for inviting Mrs. Richardson and me to be with you.

To you members of the graduating class this is an especially important day for you. It is the successful culmination of more than a years hard work. It represents many extra hours of devotion to your duties and your country. While others have been at the beach, or just resting in the back yard, you have been studying, training and improving your capabilities. You are far better men today as the result of this hard work, and I offer my congratulations on your successful completion of this course.

For those of you who are married, I would like to say a word to your wives. You ladies are to be highly congratulated for your strong support and sincere assistance to your husbands. You have been a great help to him. Perhaps he hasn't expressed his appreciation as adequately as he would have liked, or as affectionately as you would have liked. But never forget, he is as proud of you as you are of him. You both deserve a world of credit.

I see many parents in the audience today. It is especially nice that you are able to attend this ceremony. You too deserve a world of credit for your strong support of your son's efforts. After all, if it weren't for you, he wouldn't be here today.

Some of you new 2nd lieutenants will be going to active duty soon. Some will be attending your branch service school, while others will be taking positions of responsibility in Guard units. Whatever your next step may be, you owe a debt of gratitude to your families and friends for their patience, loyalty and assistance.

General Ames was very considerate when he invited me to speak today as he said I could talk on a subject of my own choosing. There is such a wealth of material to talk to you young men on because in being members of the National Guard you belong to a very dynamic and patriotic organization, and the California National Guard is the most dynamic of all. So I could have talked about the many outstanding achievements of the Guard, about your summer camp or about your week-end training sessions or many other subjects. I wanted though to talk for

a few minutes on a subject personal to you and so I have chosen leadership as my subject.

Those of you being commissioned today have heard about leadership since you first enlisted in the Guard. You have studied it, you have read about it and you have seen examples of it. But starting today it has a little different meaning to you. I really cannot tell you anything new about leadership, but perhaps I can tell it in a little different way. Perhaps too your wives and families would be interested in hearing something about it—what it is, what are the characteristics of a leader, how these characteristics will serve you and them.

What is leadership? It can be defined very simply as—the ability to lead men. But then women are leaders too. So, perhaps a better definition is that leadership is the ability to influence, to guide, to show the way, to motivate, to set an example.

What are the characteristics of leadership? They are many, and I will not attempt to put them in any order of priority—because, as the old cliché from the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth goes—"it depends on the situation".

In talking about the characteristics of leadership, now that you will be commissioned officers from today on, perhaps it would be best to look at them from the angle of your men—the ones you will be responsible for. What do they expect of you? What leadership traits are indispensable to success as a small unit leader?

Surely one is "professional competence". Another way to describe it, and perhaps a little more civilianized way is, "job qualification". It is part of what you have been working for by your attendance at the officer candidate school. "Know your job—and demonstrate it to the satisfaction of everyone". This is the trait that is the foundation of self-confidence and the one which will do most to gain the confidence of your men.

Another trait is integrity. Accept the responsibility for what your unit does or does not do; do not blame subordinates for mistakes and failures; be honest and fair in bestowing credit on your men when credit is due.

I mentioned the phrase, "what your unit does or does not do". That should be a familiar phrase to you because it is in so many of your field manuals. The entire statement is, "the commander is responsible for all that his unit does or fails to do". I always felt that this was so important that in our final training phase in Japan before going in to combat in Korea, I had a large sign painted with this statement on it and had it put up in front of the regimental C.P. I wanted all of those who visited the C.P., to see it, read it and think about it. Incidentally, that was when I had the privilege of commanding a regiment in the 40th Infantry Division, California National Guard. I was permitted to serve two years with the division and it was one of our finest tours of duty.

Another important trait or characteristic is "concern for your men". When I first came into the service, back in the early thirties, the old "field service regulations" repeatedly stated that the young platoon leader must look after the needs of his men before he considered his own needs. This was stressed in every officers school. Another term for this might be "compassion" or "loyalty". The latter, loyalty, is a two way street. If you look after your men, they will look after you.

Moral courage is another trait. The ability to adhere to tough and unpopular decisions. Be strict, but be fair. As a platoon leader, or in fact as any commander or officer, you are not in a popularity contest. Your men will respect you if you demonstrate moral courage.

Other traits are initiative, aggressiveness, sound judgment, common sense, resourcefulness, physical courage, devotion to duty, personal dignity, and willingness to accept responsibility.

You often hear the term "he is a natural born leader." This means, I believe, that the individual referred to has demonstrated certain of the qualities I have just mentioned. He inherently does certain things, his ability to lead is very pronounced. All of us have known individuals who were great combat leaders. Their physical courage was their greatest asset. This, I think, is an inherent quality, where as professional competence is something that must be developed.

"Effective leadership is the key to success in any endeavor, and development of this leadership should start at the lowest level." I do not know who originally made that statement, but it is a very true and a very profound statement, I think you will all agree. Leadership is important in all walks of life. In the military, in business, and in politics. Probably more so in the military than anywhere else. Perhaps I am prejudiced. But in what other profession is one man, such as a platoon leader, responsible for every act, thought, deed and the lives of forty men—responsible for training them, clothing them, feeding them, paying them, housing them, responsible for their medical care, their appearance, their actions both on and off duty, and the actions and living conditions of their families. It is a great responsibility and it demands leadership ability.

We hear a great deal today about a generation gap. Especially if you are over thirty. Certainly I qualify. But I do not know what this generation gap is. I don't think there is one in the military. I really don't think there is one anyplace. Perhaps it is because I do not know what is meant by the term. I do wonder, though, how these 18—19—or 20 year old hippies, yippies, or whatever they are called, became so smart all of a sudden. Where have they acquired the knowledge and the know-how, to say what courses should be given in our colleges and universities, how our country should be run, what we should do in Vietnam, and how society should behave? Most of them, as you see them roaming the streets and the highways, are perfect examples of failure to appreciate the things they have, and they show an utter lack of respect for authority. They do not want to accept any responsibility. They are not the future leaders of our country. Personally, I am a great believer that experience is a wonderful teacher. An 18—19—or 20 year old has had limited experience, at best. I will agree, however, that our younger generation today has had far more opportunities for rapid advancement, they are better educated and more knowledgeable than was my generation at their age. But who made all of this possible? Not today's younger generation. If they are smart they will take advantage of the marvelous opportunities created for them. The things that the MacArthurs, the Eisenhowers, the Dr. Sterlings, the Dr. Salks, the Von Brauns, to name only a few, have worked so hard to create so we could have a better world in which to live.

Speaking of those who have worked so hard to create a better world, I should mention Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin and Mike Collins. The Apollo 11 shot to the moon was one of the greatest achievements of our time. As those of you who had an opportunity to see the President's State dinner in Los Angeles on television the other evening, you heard them mention many times the 400,000 who worked to make this shot a success. All of those 400,000 accepted the responsibility of their part in this great endeavor. The accuracy of this shot and the reliability of all elements make this such a huge and successful feat as to be almost beyond comprehension. This undertaking will certainly do a great deal to create a better world for all of us.

You men graduating today are young, you are smart, you are well educated and well trained. You *are* taking advantage of the advanced technology in our world today. You, and the others like you who have worked so hard to get ahead—You are the future leaders of our country. You have a perfect opportunity to demonstrate your leadership abilities. In both the guard and in your business, you have the opportunity to direct into the proper channels the energies and aspirations of the young men under you. Especially is this true in the guard. These young soldiers are willing to learn, they are eager to improve their capabilities. Whether they remain in the guard or not, they will be better citizens because you have been willing to accept responsibility.

In conclusion, those of you graduating today have a great future ahead of you. You have already set a fine example for those following you. My heartiest congratulations to you and very best wishes to your wives, families and friends. Thank you.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published today in the New York Times regarding the urgent need for high priority attention to the mounting problem of air pollution from the automobile be printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

Clearly, if we are to properly confront this grave problem, every alternative must be considered in expeditious fashion. There are strong indications that the answer will have to be finding a substitute for the gasoline engine. If this is the case, we cannot afford any delay in initiating high priority efforts to find the most effective means of achieving this.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLOW CLEANING

President Nixon's Environmental Quality Council has come up with all the right worries about the impurity of urban air, but the country may choke to death before anything comes of its relief program. After three hours of discussion about the problem of automobile-produced air pollution, the Council decided that what was needed is a low-pollution vehicle for the 1990's. By way of start, the Department of Transportation will spend this year a modest $2.2 million to stimulate research on substitutes for the present high-pollution gasoline engines.

One need not be a member of the "now generation" to question the adequacy of this approach, so typical of the generally lethargic Federal attitude toward ecological problems. Ironically, the President's council adopted this feeble program on auto pollution at a meeting which had before it a report criticizing such lethargy—one prepared by the Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality headed by Laurance S. Rockefeller.

A few years ago Los Angeles was almost alone among American cities in being plagued by automobile-induced smog, but that source of discomfort and ill health is now very much a national problem. The growing alarm in this city, for example, was vividly expressed recently by Mayor Lindsay when he asked, "Can we continue to permit millions of automobiles, powered by internal combustion engines to swarm through city streets . . . spewing more and more deadly chemicals in our air?" And almost a year ago, the Commissioner of the National Air Pollution Control Administration, John T. Middleton,

warned the petroleum industry that the gains made in reducing automobile pollution threatened to be wiped out by the increasing number of vehicles.

The basic facts are that automobiles now account for over 60 per cent of all air pollution in this country, while in urban areas that figure goes up to 85 per cent. A recent Senate Commerce Committee report estimated that cars annually dump over 90 million tons of pollutants into the air Americans breathe; it noted that present approaches—which focus on limiting certain types of exhaust emission—may permit a doubling of pollution levels within thirty years as the number of cars increases.

That background makes it difficult to understand the leisurely schedule suggested in sunny, smog-free San Clemente, Calif., for development of a low-pollution vehicle. In the great cities of this country, such a vehicle is needed now.

If there were a rational allocation of this nation's priorities, an intensive program for developing needed alternative engines would long since have been under way with financing far more generous than anything the Government and private industry are now spending.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS FOR THE HONORABLE CHARLES EDISON

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the very eloquent and highly appropriate funeral address delivered by Adm. Ben Moreell on August 4, 1969, at Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church of New York City in tribute to America's great and good Charles Edison.

Mr. Edison served America well in a great many capacities, and Ben Moreell's address highlights some of his great services to this Republic. Charles Edison and Ben Moreell were steadfast friends who worked shoulder to shoulder for many years as fellow officers of Americans for Constitutional Action—ACA—and in other capacities. Both in ACA and in their respective contributions to our great American way of life in other areas of activity, Mr. Edison and Mr. Moreell have done much to fortify our American freedoms and to protect our cherished institutions.

Mr. President, I hope and believe the tribute paid to Charles Edison by Ben Moreell will do much to inspire other Americans to follow in their footsteps.

There being no objection, the memorial address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL ADDRESS FOR THE HONORABLE CHARLES EDISON, BY ADM. BEN MOREELL, CEC, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED

I am profoundly grateful for the honor of delivering the Memorial Address for Charles Edison.

It was my good fortune to be closely associated with him in the Navy, in private industry, in public affairs and in support of patriotic undertakings over a period of thirty-two years.

Our paths first crossed in January 1937, when he took the oath of office as Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Prior to that, he had been for ten years President of Thomas A. Edison, Incorporated, having previously served the same company in other capacities for thirteen years. He received his engineering education at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

With the advent of the Roosevelt Administration in 1933, Mr. Edison began his service with various government emergency operations whose purpose was to relieve human distress stemming from the great depression. The record of his numerous assignments is that of a "trouble shooter," who moved from one important post to another as critical needs arose.

His effective performance of those tasks resulted in his appointment to the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy by President Roosevelt in November, 1936. He served as Assistant Secretary until December, 1939, when he was named Secretary of the Navy, an office which he occupied until he began his campaign to be elected Governor of New Jersey in 1940.

His service as Assistant Secretary and Secretary of the Navy came during a troubled period when it appeared that war would break out in Europe at any moment and that the United States could not avoid becoming involved. Even after the war began in September, 1939, there were some amongst us who opposed any measures of military preparedness. They had prestige and power sufficient to persuade a large segment of American public opinion that any preparation to defend our Nation against foreign aggression would induce our entry into the war.

In the face of this strong opposition, Mr. Edison was able to achieve some notable advances for the Navy. I will mention only a few.

Against strong resistance within and without the Service, he succeeded in having the Navy adopt the use of high pressure steam on combatant vessels, an innovation which resulted in greatly increased battle efficiency and, as it turned out later, without increased hazards.

Early in 1940, when it became clear that we would eventually enter the war, Mr. Edison strongly advocated that the Army and the Navy, with their respective air forces, be provided at the earliest practicable date with the basic facilities which could be used for future expansions to conduct a major war. The total cost was estimated at $10 billions. Secretary Edison transmitted the program to the President with his strong recommendation for immediate action. But the President was not prepared to take such a bold step. Instead he sent to Congress a drastically curtailed program to cost $1½ billions. Congress authorized the project and appropriated the funds; and the work began promptly.

In light of subsequent events it seems clear that if the $10 billion program had been undertaken in early 1940, many lives, limbs and huge amounts of treasure would have been saved later in the war years. It is probable that the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, as well as the loss of Wake Island, Guam and possibly the Philippines would have been averted. As it was, the provision of the relatively modest sum of $1½ billions had a notably favorable effect on the later conduct of the war.

While appreciating the value of his many tangible achievements, I believe Secretary Edison's greatest contribution to the Navy was the morale-building effect of his unfailing encouragement and sympathetic understanding of our many problems in those trying prewar days when our preparations for defense of the Nation were frequently denounced as war-mongering. On many occasions he protected his subordinates from the sharp blows of critics by willingly accepting them for himself.

Charles Edison served as Democratic Governor of New Jersey from January 1941 to January 1944. His term of office was notable for his uncompromising battles with Mayor Hague, who controlled the New Jersey Democratic machine. The Governor's efforts resulted in the elimination of much of the corruption in State and local governments and the eventual elimination of Mr. Hague as a power in New Jersey politics. He initiated a movement which led to the adoption of a new State Constitution; he introduced reforms in the State Judiciary; and he succeeded in modernizing the State's tax laws.

At the conclusion of his term in 1944, he returned to business as President of Edison Industries. In 1950 he was elected Chairman of the Board of that company and in 1957 he became Chairman of the Board of the newly formed McGraw-Edison Company.

During this period he served, also, as a Director of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, the International Telegraph and Telephone Corporation and the United States Life Insurance Company.

He retired from McGraw-Edison on January 1, 1961.

While Secretary of the Navy and, later, as Governor of New Jersey, Mr. Edison had maintained his keen interest in civic affairs. When he returned to the business world, he resumed his active role in such matters.

He served as President of the National Municipal League; as a member of two of the Task Forces of the Second Hoover Commission; and on the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Reports.

He was one of the founders and an active participant in the work of the Committee of One Million (Against the Admission of Red China to the United Nations). He was Vice Chairman of the American Afro-Asian Educational Exchange; Co-Chairman of the Committee for Monroe Doctrine; Honorary President and Trustee of the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation; Vice President and Trustee of the China Institute of America; Trustee of the Stevens Institute of Technology, the Edison Birthplace Association, the Newark Museum and the North American Wildlife Association and he took part in many other important civic activities.

Although reared in a Republican household, Mr. Edison was active in Democratic politics in New Jersey from the early thirties through his term as Governor. Subsequently, as an outgrowth of his dedication to conservative principles, he aligned himself with conservative causes, groups and candidates, irrespective of Party labels.

He was one of three founders of Americans For Constitutional Action, a conservative, non-partisan, political action organization which he served as Trustee and Treasurer until his death.

He was a member of the State Committee of the New York Conservative Party.

I have given here a skeletonized account of the career of a great American, illustrious son of an illustrious father. It falls far short of defining the true measure of the man. From my close association with him over many years, I offer these thoughts:

Based on the time-honored premise that what we *do* is far more important than what we *say* and what we *are* is most important of all, Charles Edison easily passes all of the requirements for immortality as a great American patriot.

Foremost amongst his many admirable traits were his profound reverence for his father, the greatest benefactor of humanity in the history of our Country; and his devotion to his charming wife, Carolyn, his working partner for forty-six active years.

Charles Edison was a man of principle. He knew what he believed in and he had the courage to stand up and be counted when the chips were down and the weather was rough. He never sacrificed principle on the altar of expediency. He adhered steadfastly to his own high standards of personal honor and official conduct.

He was a friendly man who inspired friendship in others.

He was an understanding man. Being fully aware of the frailties of human nature, he did not expect perfection in others just as he renounced any claims to perfection in himself. Thus, he was overly generous in his appraisals of his fellow man.

He was a humble man, who knew that without humility one cannot have an open mind which is receptive to the truth.

He was a generous man, who believed in and practiced the biblical admonition: "Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, and running over. . ." Thus, he gave freely of his time, his energies and his material means to countless patriotic, charitable and civic causes and to many worthy individuals who needed a helping hand over the rough spots of life's journey.

He was without the slightest taint of bigotry, intolerance or prejudice, appraising every man on his own merits, respecting his personal dignity and his individual rights as a child of God.

He was a self-disciplined man. He knew that the optimum in personal conduct flows from voluntary obedience to the laws which govern a good life, which are enforceable only by the power of one's own conscience.

And, finally, he was a dedicated American patriot who loved his Country, its ideals, its traditions, and its fundamental principles which, together, have enabled ours to become the greatest Nation in recorded history, in terms of human dignity, spiritual strength and material prosperity.

Charles Edison was a leader of men who, by the power of his personal example, inspired countless others to emulate his devotion to righteous causes, even those causes whose futures looked very bleak. He was always ready to fight for what was right and what was good, even when the fight appeared to be for a lost cause. For he knew that fighting for a lost cause can give meaning and savor to life; that men are tempered in the fires of adversity; and that rough seas make good sailors!

There could be no more fitting ending to this tribute than to quote the closing words of Charles Edison's address at the testimonial dinner given in his honor on May 2d, 1963. After recounting the awful perils now confronting our beloved Country, Mr. Edison said:

"The world has seen many dark times. One period of history was even called the Dark Ages. But even in those times, men carried on. In those years, there were monks who went from town to town—from country to country. Under their robes they carried with them the manuscripts, the learning of the centuries gone before. They were hunted from place to place, and yet they carried with them the light of knowledge and the light of truth. Without them, all would have been lost.

"Perhaps that is the function of Americans today—to keep on fighting and to carry with them the eternal truths laid down by our Founding Fathers.

"I have lived a good many years. No one knows all the answers, but I do know this: in the time that is left me, I will continue fighting for America—for what it really is and what it really means. And so must we all—no matter what the obstacles and no matter how discouraged we may become. To give up would, indeed, be a sin against the memory of all those heroes of the past who have given us a nation."

Charles Edison could have left us no more precious legacy than that. It is a legacy of inspiration for millions of Americans who are here now and many more who will come after us, to keep fighting for America—"for what it really is and what it really means!"

We have lost a great leader, a great fighter, and a beloved friend.

Our Nation is much the poorer for that loss. May we be comforted by the knowledge that his indomitable spirit lives on to inspire us!

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE).

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) is temporarily detained. He is expected on the floor in just a few minutes. He will make the opening argument for the amendment.

Mr. President, I do not want the floor until after the Senator from Minnesota has spoken. I shall be here and hope to get the floor after the Senator from Minnesota.

I have also asked the Senator from Virginia if he could present his views. There is no time limitation, as the Senate knows. Perhaps it is possible or probable that we could get an agreement to vote on the amendment sometime late on Friday next, the Senate not being in session tomorrow. That will depend, of course, upon the prospects for attendance because we should have fairly full attendance before the amendment is voted on.

I have nothing further to announce at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RECESS TODAY TO ENABLE SENATORS TO ATTEND FUNERAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE SENATOR EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished majority leader, I make the following announcement: It is suggested that the Senate will recess at 11:45, subject to the call of the Chair. The Senate will then proceed in a body to the rotunda to pay its respects to the late minority leader, Everett McKinley Dirksen, as his body is removed from the Capitol.

Transportation will be available to the 1 p.m. services to be held at the National Presbyterian Church, 4123 Nebraska Avenue NW.

Senators attending the church services should assemble on the Senate stairs of the Capitol at 12:15 p.m.

It is likely that the Senate will reconvene by 3 p.m.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) may proceed for not to exceed 15 minutes on a speech he wishes to make, and that the rule of germaneness be waived.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—the understanding was that the Senator from Minnesota would have the floor this morning. He is on his way here now, I should like to inquire if this is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. MOSS. My remarks will be quite brief. I understand that the Senator from Minnesota is coming over to the Chamber now.

Mr. STENNIS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) my proceed for not to exceed 15 minutes, and the rule of germaneness is waived.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am clearly aware of the understanding with respect to the Senator from Minnesota. I inquired of his office as to whether he was on his way over here and it was my understanding that he was. I therefore thought we might as well fill the hiatus while he was getting here and let the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) make his remarks.

Mr. MOSS. I appreciate that very much. I shall not be very long.

SUGGESTION THAT GENERAL HERSHEY RETIRE ON FRIDAY, HIS 76TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise today for an unpleasant but necessary purpose. This Friday, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey will be 76 years old. I think that would be an appropriate occasion for the general to announce his retirement as Director of the Selective Service System.

This is an unpleasant request because General Hershey has served his country long—for 28 years—as Director of the Selective Service. And it is unpleasant because it is somewhat unfair to blame a single man for the faults and failings of an entire system.

Nevertheless, it is time for General Hershey to retire. In his age, in his manner, and in some of his deeds, General Hershey symbolizes the outmoded and arbitrary nature of the Selective Service System. His determined attempts, despite the objections of the Attorney General, to use the draft to punish dissent and his recent paralyzation of the presidential appeal board amply demonstrate his autocratic disregard for the constitutional rights of those who disagree with him.

Of course, it cannot be denied that more than a new director is needed to reform the draft. The cruel inequities and uncertainties of the present system should have been corrected long ago; yet in neither House of the Congress have hearings been held. Congress has been terribly insensitive to these legitimate criticisms by young men facing the draft. School is now resuming and nothing has been done. Such neglect is a disgrace to the democratic process, which, as we are always telling the young, is supposed to respond to the will of the people.

If press reports are accurate, President Nixon is about to issue an Executive order which would draft the youngest first. I commend this action because it will help remove some of the uncertainties which now haunt many young men over a span of 5 or 6 years.

But Mr. Nixon can go still further without legislative action by finding a new Director of the Selective Service System who understands the feelings of young people and who will at least administer the laws with an even hand. The retirement, or if it comes to that, the removal, of General Hershey could be a meaningful first gesture to the Nation's young that their Government is beginning to respond. We cannot allow any longer our young to watch with hopelessness this futility in Washington.

CONSUMER SEMINARS HELD BY SENATOR MOSS IN UTAH DURING RECESS.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I would like to report to the Senate on the very useful and informative consumer seminars which I held in my home State during the recess.

In one sense, these six seminars served as a traveling complaint bureau where consumers could get a hearing for their grievances. But I believe consumers have more than a right to complain; they also have a right to participate in the making of consumer protection laws. I told those who attended—and I am even more convinced after this experience—that we Senators can sit back in Washington and pass all the laws we want. But they will do the consumer little good unless these laws are fair, unless they are reasonable, and unless they are workable. On the practical level, a law handed down from Washington is unlikely to be able to cope with the realities of the marketplace.

I made a point of trying to find out if the recently enacted consumer legislation was working as we intended. The answer to my question may be that it is too early to tell. Truth in lending just came into effect on July 1, and the impact of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act—FPLA—is just beginning to be felt. The disclosure provisions of the Truth-in-Lending Act has, however, made many of our citizens aware for the first time just how much interest they were paying. Whether the act has affected consumer purchasing decisions is impossible to determine. Ideally, the disclosure of actual interest rates should cause credit retailers to compete by lower rates.

It is already clear, however, that consumers are not satisfied with the effects of FPLA. I heard many complaints about the difficulty of comparative shopping. Because many items are packaged in fractional sizes, one woman said she needed a "computer in her purse" in order to determine which brand was the least expensive. Even within the same brand this difficulty existed. When I held up three tubes of the same brand of toothpaste in sizes of 8.75 ounces, 6.75 ounces, and 3.25 ounces, no one could tell me which was the best buy without going through a complicated arithmetic procedure. As one woman in Brigham City said to me:

> Why do they put things in such sizes except to deceive us. Why can't we have things in good old American sizes?

I had to tell her that FPLA provided only for voluntary compliance by industry in the size of packages. She was not pleased.

Not only were the fractional sizes severely criticized, but the identity and percentage of the contents were often difficult, if not impossible, to determine. To demonstrate this problem, I would first read the contents of a can of deviled ham which listed the ingredients of ham and ham fat. Then I would read the label on a can of dog food. The label lists not only the identity of the contents, but also the percentage of each. The least we can expect, it seems to me, is that human food should be labeled as well as dog food.

Many women also despaired at finding boxes and packages not completely full. Said a woman in Ogden:

> Twelve ounces of cookies doesn't mean much to me, but the size of the box does. Boy, was I fooled.

Art Buchwald satirized the slack-fill phenomenon in a typically delightful column. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the close of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a constant subject in our seminars was the bad experiences that many have had with door-to-door sales. There are many glib, fast-talking salesmen who employ such schemes as bait advertising, fictitious pricing, chain referral selling, deceptive giveaways, and simple scare and high-pressure tactics. A man in Ogden said he was made to feel like a heel because he would not purchase a $300 fire alarm system. The Ogden man said the salesman had him "hypnotized" into believing that his children were going to burn to death that very night.

A favorite trick is to tell the unsuspecting buyer that the company wants to use the house as a before-and-after advertisement and will, therefore, sell the carpeting or the aluminum siding "for practically nothing." "Practically nothing" usually turns out to be much higher than the market price.

No law, of course, can outlaw persuasive salesmen nor can it bar all door-to-door sales. But legislation that would provide a 48-hour cooling off period during which the buyer could rescind any unsolicited sale made in the home would meet with much favor.

I heard numerous tales of woe about warranties and guarantees. A woman from Vernal noted that requiring the buyer to ship the merchandise back to the factory effectively negated the value of the warranty. Most people cannot afford to be without an essential appliance for the many weeks and months that returning it to the factory consumes.

A Price woman asked:

> What is a lifetime guarantee? Whose lifetime, mine or the chair I bought?

But the major complaint about warranties was the incomprehensible language used in the warranty. Oftentimes consumers found that significant parts of a product's mechanism were not covered, but this had not been made clear at the time of sale. As a man in Tooele put it:

> The fine print takes away what you thought the bold print had given you.

A woman from Price complained that she needed a lawyer to understand the warranty. I replied that sometimes even attorneys had difficulty.

We also discussed proposed legislation dealing with the packaging of poisonous items, toy safety, home improvement frauds, tire defects, and consumer councils. Helpful suggestions were made on all these subjects.

The purpose of the legislation we discussed was not just to protect the consumer but to make free enterprise work. Free enterprise is based on the theory that competition will create the lowest prices and the best goods, but that theory depends upon having an informed consumer who is free to choose. We cannot allow the substitution of cajoling for quality; of hidden persuasion for price. A strongly competitive market based on quality and quantity is to the best interest of all—the producer as well as the consumer.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 31, 1969]

PACKAGED INFLATION—LESS AND LESS GOES INTO EVER BIGGER CARTONS

(By Art Buchwald)

The wonderful thing about American industry is that it rises to every challenge. Even something as distasteful as inflation has not discouraged most manufacturers. Their solution to the problem is not in the product but in the package.

Rather than raise the prices on many goods, American industry is devising new methods to make the product smaller while making the package larger. In this way, the

customer feels assured that nothing has changed.

I visited one of the largest packaging companies in the country the other day to see how they were doing it. The vice president in charge of inflationary design took me around the plant.

"We're going 24 hours a day," he said proudly. "Everyone is asking us for new designs to help them get through this rough period."

I noticed women in white smocks working with tweezers under microscopes. "What are those women doing?" I asked.

"Those are 5-cent chocolate bars on their tweezers. They put each one in that large aluminum foil and then they wrap wax paper around it. Over the wax paper they put the name of the chocolate bar in large letters. Here's one that's finished."

"Why, from the outside it looks like an old-fashioned chocolate bar!"

"No one can tell the difference until they open the package," he said proudly.

We went into another part of the building. There were air hoses hanging all over the ceiling and boxes were rolling along a conveyor belt.

I looked perplexed.

"We're packaging soap flakes in here," he shouted above the din. "The lady down at the beginning of the line puts one teaspoon of soap flakes into those giant-sized boxes; then those men over there with the hoses pump air into the rest of the box."

"How ingenious!" I shouted back.

"The bottom of the box is weighted with very heavy cardboard so no one will know, when picking up the box, how many soap flakes there are in it."

"That's a lot of air to put in a box."

"We don't only use the air for soap flakes. We also use it for cereals, baking products and anything that comes in a box.

"Let me show you this invention which we have a patent on. This is a see through wax paper window for noodles. Well, when you look at it, you think you're getting a full box of noodles. Right?"

"Of course."

"Now look at the inside of the box."

"Why, the only noodles in it are stuck to the window," I said in amazement.

"Yup. The windows and the noodles are magnetized. When the window fills up with noodles, the box moves on."

"Are those frozen TV dinners over there?"

"They certainly are. They look like a complete dinner, don't they?"

"You bet."

"Now look under the tray. You see how it's indented. There's nothing in the tray but what you see on the top."

"Fantastic," I said.

He took me into another building which had a large sign, "Pharmaceuticals," on the outside. "This is where we work on new packaging for medicines." He opened a door and everywhere I looked were large mounds of white cotton.

"What do you do with that stuff?" I asked.

"We put two pills in each bottle of medicine and stuff the rest of it with white cotton. If it weren't for cotton, I don't think the drug industry could survive."

"You people think of everything."

"Not everything. Our dream is to devise a package filled with nothing but air, cotton and aluminum foil. If you bought one, you'd get a second package free."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 146

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, at the end of yesterday's session, I called up the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and myself dealing with the pending authorization for a nuclear aircraft carrier. I refer to amendment No. 146, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment (No. 146) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 16, strike out "2,568,200,000;" and insert in lieu thereof "2,191,100,000;"

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 402. (a) None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be expended in connection with the production or procurement of the nuclear aircraft carrier designated as CVAN-69; and no funds may be appropriated for any such purpose until after the Congress has completed a comprehensive study and investigation of the past and projected costs and effectiveness of attack aircraft carriers and their task forces and a thorough review of the considerations which went into the decision to maintain the present number of attack carriers. Such study and investigation shall, among other things, consider—

"(1) what are the primary limited war missions of the attack carrier; what role, if any, does it have in strategic nuclear planning;

"(2) to what extent and in what way is the force level of on-station and backup carriers related to potential targets and the number of sorties needed to destroy these targets;

"(3) what is the justification for maintaining on continual deployment two carriers in the Mediterranean and from three to five in the Western Pacific;

"(4) what is the overall attack carrier force level needed to carry out these primary missions;

"(5) does the present 'one for one' replacement policy for these carriers have the effect of maintaining or increasing this force level, in light of the fact that the newer carriers and their aircraft are more expensive and have far more capability than the older carriers which they are now replacing;

"(6) would a policy of replacing two of the oldest carriers with one modern carrier maintain a constant force level;

"(7) how many, if any, attack carriers and carrier task forces are needed to back up a carrier task force 'on the line';

"(8) what efficiencies, such as the Polaris 'blue and gold' crew concept, can be utilized to increase the time in which a carrier can stay 'on' the line';

"(9) what type of military threats are faced by the attack carrier; what proportion of the costs of a carrier task force are allocated to carrier defense; what is the estimated effectiveness of carrier defense against various types and levels of threats;

"(10) to what extent does the carrier's vulnerability affect its capacity to carry out its missions; what are the plausible contingencies in which carriers may be committed;

"(11) what type of resources should be devoted to carrier defense, considering the range of threats, the costs and effectiveness of the defense, and the plausible contingencies in which a carrier can be effectively used;

"(12) to what extent can land-based tactical air power substitute for attack carriers; to what extent should the role of the attack carrier be restricted to the initial stages of a conflict;

"(13) what are the comparative systems costs for land-based and sea-based tactical air power;

"(14) what is the comparative cost effectiveness of land-based and sea-based tactical air power; and

"(15) how is the attack carrier being used in support of American foreign policy; if there is a need for a 'show of force' in support of foreign policy commitments, can this need be met by smaller carriers or other types of ships.

"(b) In order to assist the Congress in carrying out such study and investigation, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review and make a report to the Congress on items number '(8)' and '(13)' in subsection 'a', above. He shall also review any studies which have been made, or may be made, by the executive branch which relate to the other items listed in subsection 'a', above. He shall provide summaries of such studies, together with any appropriate comments or quesitons, to the Congress. The report and summaries provided for by this subsection shall be furnished to the Congress not later than April 30, 1970."

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this amendment is a modification of our original amendment, and is the one which Senator CASE and I propose be adopted.

In the first quarter of this century, a great debate arose in military circles over the question of whether automatic fire and mechanization made the horse cavalry obsolete. Even though it was obvious to everyone but cavalry men that this institution had outlived its usefulness before World War I, it took another 30 years before the advocates of modern technology were able to put the cavalry to rest once and for all.

It may seem strange to us today that the horse cavalry was able to survive for so long in defiance of technology and the 20th century. But military history, as one commentator noted, "is studded with institutions which have managed to dodge the challenge of the obvious."

A clear example of this phenomenon from naval history is the battleship's durability in remaining at the center of naval planning. It was not until World War II that naval strategists recognized what had long been obvious to most military observers: that modern airpower had ended the battleship's role as the keystone of the fleet.

The most recent example of the tenacity of military institutions can be found in the military authorization bill now be-

fore the Senate. That bill contains the Navy's requested authorization for a new nuclear attack carrier, a request based upon an assumption which has gone unchallenged and generally unexamined since the end of World War II: that the U.S. Navy must maintain at least 15 attack carriers in its fleet.

Like its forerunner, the battleship, the attack carrier is now the heart of our fleet. Questions about its role and proper force level are often viewed as a challenge to the Navy's existence.

Nevertheless, I do have some serious doubts about continuing to authorize additional attack carriers without first obtaining adequate justification for a fleet of this size.

In expressing doubts about our present carrier policy, I am not alone. Within the confines of the Pentagon there has been ever increasing doubt about the attack carrier force level. Much of this debate has been kept from public view. For example, the Defense Department's Office of Systems Analysis has often recommended cuts in the attack carrier fleet, but the studies underlying these recommendations have not been made public, and many have been referred to me upon my request.

However, these recommendations did come to light in the Defense Department's posture statement for fiscal 1965—presented by Secretary McNamara on February 4, 1964—which called for "some reduction in the number of attack carriers by the early 1970's." The factors underlying this decision were the increased tactical air capability of modern carriers and modern carrier-based aircraft, the end of the carrier's role as part of our strategic nuclear forces, and the reduced need for forward based airpower due to the increased range of land-based tactical aircraft.

Criticism of the carrier force level from within the Defense Department has persisted. Dr. Arthur Herrington, a Department official, questioned the size of the carrier fleet in a recent speech at the Naval War College—published in the September 1969 issue of the Naval War College Review. He said:

> Today we still plan a 15-(attack carrier) force for the future. Yet over this 25-year period we have seen: a polarization of the world into Communist and non-Communist camps, and lately an increasing fragmentation of both; the development of the Marshall Plan, NATO, the conversion of our enemy in the Pacific, Japan, to an ally, and the conversion of our old ally, China, to an enemy; a doubling of the size of the attack carrier; nuclear propulsion; jet aircraft and nuclear weapons. In truth, 15 attack carriers (or 15 capital ships in the U.S. Navy if you will) appears to be close to an "eternal verity" in U.S. military planning.

The most revealing admission of the Pentagon's own doubts about the justification for 15 attack carriers can be found in a Departmental Statement filed with the Joint Economic Committee. Representative MOORHEAD of that committee asked the Defense Department to explain the necessity for a force of 15 attack carriers. A Department spokesman wrote in reply:

> It is very difficult to determine the precise division of effort between land-based and sea-based forces which will meet our worldwide commitments at the least cost. The program supported by the previous administration included 15 attack carriers.

He does not refer, apparently, to the Secretary's statement of 1965. Continuing:

> In response to a directive by the National Security Council to examine alternative General Purpose Force strategies, we are currently reassessing both the total requirement for tactical aircraft to meet each alternative strategy and the relative costs and effectiveness of different mixes of land-based and sea-based aircraft. Pending completion of this study, we are not recommending any major changes in the previous program.

I should like to emphasize what it is the Defense Department is telling us here. In effect, it is that the Defense Department, right now, is undertaking the very kind of study that we are asking them to undertake by our amendment. As we meet today, the Defense Department and the National Security Council are engaged in the very kind of study we are talking about. It will include both the total requirement for tactical aircraft and the relative cost and effectiveness of land-based and sea-based aircraft. That is what the Defense Department and the National Security Council are doing. Surely this is a study of sufficient significance to involve the effort of Congress as well.

It is interesting that the Defense Department takes the position that, while they see serious questions surrounding the present level of attack carrier forces, sufficient to require them to undertake this searching review of force levels. Nevertheless, pending the conclusion of that study, we should continue spending billions of dollars on a force structure that is now in doubt and under serious study. One would guess that the more proper way of proceeding would be to complete the study, find out what we need, and then establish spending levels. But the position of the Navy is the other way around: Continue to spend, assuming the continuance of a policy about which there is now, we admit, great doubt.

I think it is the wrong way around. When asked to justify a 15-carrier force level, the Defense Department tells a congressional committee that the matter is under study. In the meantime, we are asked to spend millions of dollars to maintain this force level, until Defense officials find the time or inclination to determine the proper size of the attack carrier fleet.

I think it is also important, for the RECORD, to state at this time that that study has been completed, or will be completed in the next few days.

It is in hand or soon will be in hand in the National Security Council, supposedly determining the very issue we are now dealing with. So, we are in the fortunate situation of having a defense study which bears upon the very issues which is central to the whole matter, either completed or shortly to be available.

Other high-level Government officials directly responsible for defense planning have also expressed doubts about our carrier policy. Charles Schultze, a former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, recently testified before the Joint Economic Committee that the request for an additional attack carrier was the first item to be examined in eliminating unnecessary military expenditures. And a national news magazine has reported that officials in the present administration are seriously considering cutting the number of attack carriers from 15 to 12.

Similar reservations have also been expressed by military strategists and military historians. In a lengthy case study on the evolution of the attack carrier, Dr. Desmond Wilson—now at the Center for Naval Analysis, a Navy "think-tank"—raised serious questions about the justification for 15 attack carriers.

These doubts and reservations about the need of 15 attack carriers may explain the growing congressional concern over the carrier program. In addition to those of us in the Senate who have voiced this concern, the distinguished Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee recently stated that he intends to take a close look at the Navy's request for a nuclear attack carrier.

In questioning the need for an additional attack carrier, I am not advocating any weakening of our defense posture.

It is significant that despite the abundant amount of evidence that top, responsible leaders in the Defense Department for years have been urging a serious review of the carrier force level, that the Secretary of Defense himself proposed a reduction of such level, that the systems analysis has repeatedly called for a reduction in such levels, and that U.S. scholars and responsible critics have called for such reduction, those of us who propose considering such a course are greeted with the charge that we are for unilateral or partial unilateral disarmament and are opposed to America being No. 1 in defense posture.

In response to our questions about why we should have 15 attack carriers, we have received no answer. The only answer we have received that is responsible at all is that the matter is under study and that we soon should know what the carrier-force level should be, but that until they do decide to go ahead, we should go right ahead and spend the billions of dollars requested.

The key issue concerning the 15 attack carriers is one to which the Navy has addressed itself.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of September 8, 1969, there was an article entitled, "Air Force Study May Spur Navy Carrier Debate," written by George Wilson.

The article contained a reference to a report from the U.S. Air Force which stated that there are enough air land bases in Southeast Asia and Europe to base all of the tactical fighter aircraft which the Joint Chiefs of Staff estimate are required to meet a major contingency in those areas.

The article went on to state that the capability of the U.S. Air Force tactical

air has in no sense been diminished by land-based inactivations.

Does not this report by the Air Force buttress the argument which the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New Jersey are making in support of their amendment that there is no urgent defense need for the hundreds of millions of dollars requested by the Pentagon that the amendment in question would defer pending further study?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Maryland raised the point. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a document from the Air Force which was the basis for the Wilson argument. This demonstrates that Mr. Wilson was exactly accurate in saying that the Air Force contends that land-based air is more than adequate for any action which the Joint Chiefs of Staff would contemplate in Europe or Southeast Asia.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR BASE CLOSURES

Of the major air bases closed since the Korean War (attachment 1), only those in Morocco, France and Saudi Arabia could be classified as involuntary or political closures. All others and some in France were closed because they either were no longer needed or were closed for economic reasons. Dhahran, Saudi Arabia retains a USAF presence. Many of the bases were used by the Strategic Air Command and as auxiliary bases for tactical air units. Although listed as major installations, those designated "AFD" and "ASN" were not used to base tactical flying units on a permanent basis. With the possible exception of France and Morocco most of the closed bases could be easily reactivated if necessary to support contingency operations. In the event of a Warsaw Pact-NATO conflict it is considered probable that the use of French bases would be approved.

Only one air base closure has posed problems in contingency planning. An operation conducted in support of the Israelis could not be supported through Dhahran. Even in this case an exception might be made in the event of overt Soviet aggression. None of the other base changes to date have jeopardized contingency plans nor prevented the formulation of contingency plans to meet current commitments. There are enough land air bases in Southeast Asia and Europe to base all the tactical fighter aircraft which the Joint Chiefs of Staff estimate are required to meet a major contingency in those areas.

In addition, as demonstrated in Attachment 2, there are airfields all over the world that are adequate to support tactical air combat operations. There are more than 1,700 Free World airfields with runways 5,000 feet or longer and there are 685 airfields with runways 8,000 feet or longer. Any nation which requests the assistance of U.S. military forces can be expected to permit use of its airfields. The Air Force is developing bare base equipment which will provide the capability to deploy to any base which has a runway, taxiways, ramp space and potable water source.

In summary, the majority of the land air bases that have been inactivated were not needed or were closed to decrease expenses, although some were closed for political reasons. The capability of USAF tactical air has in no sense been diminished by land base inactivations. Attachment 3 summarizes the number of inactivated and operational USAF bases and the Free World airfields.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have several things to say about the observation of the Senator from Maryland. First of all, I see very little evidence that the Navy and the Air Force have got together to decide what their complementary roles are.

I think that each is trying to outdo the other and that there is an overlap and waste of the tactical air available in certain areas and perhaps none at all in other areas.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the more we study this area of comparative cost for air defense and air support and the different requests made by the Air Force and the Navy for multibillion-dollar projects that are redundant or largely overlapping, the clearer it becomes the Pentagon has really declined to make a judgment as to the most effective means to spend our defense dollars.

It almost appears that they feel that Congress will appropriate anything asked for and that therefore they will give both competing groups, the Air Force and the Navy in this instance, everything they want without regard to where the priorities really are or how the taxpayer is best served.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is accurate in making that statement. However, I think the situation is worse than that.

I have been inadvertently supplied with information about what the Systems Analysis Office has said this year concerning reduction of tactical force levels in terms of the shockingly high cost of sea-based tactical air relative to land-based air.

The Defense Department has ignored the advice of its own Systems Analysis Office in supporting and, in effect, repeating demands for land- and sea-based air without reconciling and making complementary the competing striking force.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. COOK. Mr President, with regard to the debate just had between the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Minnesota, would the Senator from Minnesota also admit that regardless of the fact that a report may show that there were adequate bases in Korea at the outset of the war, every land-based airfield was immediately overrun and the only air support the troops in South Korea had in the original incidents occurring in that war was from aircraft carriers?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I inform the Senator from Kentucky first that it must be clearly understood what the pending amendment would do.

We are not saying that we should have no aircraft carriers. In fact, the Senator from New Jersey and I make it very clear that we think there should be aircraft carriers. Also, we are not saying there have not been occasions when the carrier has been useful.

We are saying that we do not need 15 attack carriers.

Recently the Chief of Naval Operations in a speech before the VFW cited a need for the aircraft carriers and cited 50 wars or near wars in which this country has been involved since 1946.

I was fascinated by the figures. I asked for them. Some of the wars were wars in which carriers were not used but were only alerted.

Some wars involved enemies whose chief weapon would be a 10-pound rock incapable of sinking a carrier or even chipping paint off its side.

The question is whether we need 15 nuclear attack carriers costing $1.8 billion a year in the light of the record over the last 23 years in which we have found that kind of involvement.

This does not say that there have not been times when the carrier has been useful. The question is, Do we need 15 of them, and do we need 15 nuclear attack carrier task forces which are so exceedingly expensive?

Mr. COOK. I should like to reply to the Senator, but first I wish to get into the RECORD the fact that every airfield in South Korea was overrun. It was necessary for the first airstrikes in Korea to be totally and completely sustained by aircraft carriers. The record shows that it was absolutely necessary that the first airstrikes in South Vietnam be sustained by aircraft carriers.

To get to the second point of the Sentor's discussion, it really has never been so emblematic of the Navy and the Defense Department that there be 15 aircraft carriers. If the Senator will check the RECORD, he will find that at the commencement of the Korean conflict there were not 15 but either seven or nine, and at the height of that conflict, in fact, there were 19 aircraft carriers.

When we speak of building one, we must also remember—and I think every Member of the Senate must remember—that we now have four aircraft carriers in operation which are 19 and 25 years old, respectively. One is 19 and three are 25 years old. All four should be phased out. Three of them should have been phased out 5 years ago. All four are now in use. When these aircraft carriers are put into use in the Vietnam theater at the present time, for example, and four modern carriers are withdrawn, we are subjecting the pilots of the airplanes off those four aircraft carriers to the use of second- and third-rate airplanes, because modern Navy aircraft are not capable of landing on those four aircraft carriers in the oldest class. Is that not true?

Mr. MONDALE. First, we have repeatedly said that there may be a need for aircraft carriers in search situations, as the Navy refers to them—and that there was a short period around Korea when, for a period, most if not all of the land-based air potential on the Korean peninsula was removed.

But does that satisfy the Senator from Kentucky that a case has been established for a fleet of 15 attack carriers or for a policy that does not involve holding our own but, because these new carriers are almost twice as effective and three times more expensive than the old carriers to which he has made reference, puts us into almost doubling attack carrier potential over the next few years?

Second, as to the issue of whether we have maintained an attack carrier force level of 15 without a rationale over the past years, I am aware of the Navy's arguments, and I say that they are highly misleading.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an attack carrier force table prepared by Dr. Desmond Wilson, which shows that the level of attack carrier forces since 1946 has been exactly 15.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE XIV.—ACTIVE CARRIER FORCE (1946-64) (ATTACK CARRIERS OR THEIR EARLY EQUIVALENTS)[1]

Year	Atlantic/ Mediterranean	Pacific	Total
1946	7	11	18
1947	9	6	15
1948	7	5	12
1949	7	5	12
1950	9	2	11
1951	9	6	15
1952	10	7	17
1953	9	9	18
1954	9	8	17
1955	7	10	17
1956	6	9	15
1957	6	8	14
1958	6	9	15
1960	6	9	15
1961	6	9	15
1962	6	9	15
1963	6	9	15
1964	6	9	15

[1] See app. A for complete listing of carrier force by ship type.

Mr. COOK. I might say to the Senator that the number 15 really does not bother me, except in its ineptness to take care of a situation, for example, such as World War II. Prior to World War II we still had subscribed to that particular level, but during the course of World War II, of one kind or another, we had approximately 100 carriers that were available for the discharge of aircraft, in the defense of this Nation.

I can only say to the Senator that we come down to a matter of saying, "Would you rather have 15 to start from, when you may have to have 100, or would you rather have 10 to start from, when you may have to have 100, in the event of another major world war that would in essence be nonnuclear or even nuclear?"

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The questions raised by the Senator from Kentucky are interesting, because they pose a point; namely, would we rather have 15 carriers or would we rather have 100? In answer to that question, perhaps we might say that it would be reassuring to have 200, assuming the worst possible contingencies. But this is all speculation. I would say that the answer should be supplied by the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, based—and I hope the Senator from Kentucky will listen to me——

Mr. COOK. I am listening.

Mr. TYDINGS. Based on whether it is more cost-effective given current conditions to invest primarily in tactical aircraft utilizing our land bases around the world, or in carrier-based aircraft, or in some mix of the two. In addition, we need figures before authorizing more money in this area comparing present contingencies with those that existed in the Korea period and before when the figure of 15 carriers was deemed desirable.

I think that is one of the basic issues in this debate—to get the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs to make a choice based on comparative costs and comparative abilities. I think if we got the facts from the Pentagon, we would find out that it costs, over a 10-year period, almost a billion dollars more to support a wing of aircraft carrier planes than it does to support a similar wing of land based planes.

I believe that the report which the Air Force has released stating, that their capability in operating from land bases in Southeast Asia and Europe today is equal to handling any foreseeable contingencies is of tremendous import.

I think we have to consider all these things together before making a decision to commit billions of dollars over a period of years in support of increased carrier strength. We owe it to the American people to require certain choices and decisions to be made by the Secretary of Defense and the Pentagon, and to not just give them basically everything they want enabling them to avoid the hard choice between the competing demands of the various service branches.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I will yield for one more question, and then I will return to my text.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to make an observation with respect to the article from the Washington Post which has been put in the RECORD.

I have to say, from very close personal knowledge of this matter, that this is another example of partial information being leaked to the Washington Post. If the Senator wanted to go into the Pentagon, he could find any number of unclassified items that are parts of war games studies or continuing studies. This is a part of a study.

The Air Force and the Navy are working very closely together in the entire field of tactical air; and I might say, in defense of the carrier in Southeast Asia, that the daily targeting committee over there meets constantly—the Navy and the Air Force—to decide on targets. The value of carriers in the Tonkin Gulf is that they can make strikes which would require air-to-air refueling if the Air Force attempted to make them, which is very expensive. It cuts down the weapons load.

The Navy has taken over the entire responsibility of the tactical attacks on North Vietnam and has relieved the Air Force from much of this responsibility, except for strikes they make from the other countries up there.

I hope that we are not subjected to a continuation of these partial reports emanating, so-called, from the Pentagon through the Washington Post. I do not know whether or not this paper was classified secret. I doubt that it was.

Mr. MONDALE. I have just put it into the RECORD.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have the entire report, and this is merely a part of the entire report. The military planner has to lay out everything.

The old estimate of the situation still applies. We have to try to guess what the enemy will do. If they do this, what will we do? If the Navy can do this, what can the Air Force do; or if the Air Force can do this, what can the Navy do? What will be the reaction of the enemy? This is all a part of the study that goes on constantly. The Navy and the Air Force are working very closely together in theory in the Pentagon and in practice all over Southeast Asia.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from Arizona. The report was not classified. I think the reporter for the Washington Post quoted it very accurately. To demonstrate this, I have placed in the RECORD the Air Force letter, substantiating categorically what the article said. I think this is one of the items that should be considered if the study contemplated in the pending amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the entire study should be in the RECORD. This is merely a part of it.

Mr. MONDALE. Maybe they would submit more of the classified studies; that would help our case.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not think they should do that. They are so top secret the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) felt he should not read them. I think the Washington Post is the best source of secret information available. It is even better than going to the Pentagon.

Mr. MONDALE. My impression is that the Pentagon system of classification has more to do with political embarrassment than with hiding information from the enemy. That has been my experience.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I disagree with the Senator. In these particular cases the Senator is calling for reports and the Senator from Wisconsin has called for reports, and I suppose every other American will call for reports. However, these are probably the most highly classified bits of information in the Pentagon. I want no part of seeing them. Members of the Committee on Armed Services are cleared for the most secret documents but they refuse to see the material. It pertains to our most secret information on the enemy and I do not think we should see it.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield briefly to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOK. I want to make clear to the Senator, and I am sorry the Senator from Maryland has left the Chamber, that the Senator from Kentucky is not one who has permitted the Pentagon to wildly spend money and not ask questions. I think the record is clear on this point.

Second, in regard to the increased cost of airpower by way of carriers rather than land bases, I think we should consider in this entire argument that if we refuse to continue to modernize our Navy, and obviously we have been dragging our feet in this regard for years, we place ourselves in the position where the cost to maintain old carriers and old-

er aircraft is considerably higher. On older aircraft the accident rate has a ratio of 2 to 1 compared with modern aircraft.

The Senator from Maryland will say that the cost to maintain these squadrons will continue to grow and the only way is to supply America with an adequate and modern Navy.

Mr. MONDALE. I agree with the Senator. We want an adequate and modern Navy. We have 10 carriers which are under 13 years old; we have three Midways, too, which have been modernized. One of the alternatives this study suggests is the possibility of replacing not one, but two, of the older carriers. The idea here is not to pass judgment on this, but to come up with a responsible study on the question of how many carriers we do need, how they would be used, what kind of carriers, so that we can have a modern and adequate Navy, and one which is consistent with the financial realities of the country as we see it today. This study would be a modest and long overdue effort, and one which could probe into some of the questions raised by the Senator from Kentucky.

In questioning the need for an additional attack carrier, I am not advocating any weakening of our defense posture.

My questions refer to the complete lack of justification for a continuing fleet of 15 attack carrier task forces: In light of the acknowledged change in the role of the carrier in our overall defense plans; in light of great changes in the international situation and the kinds of threats to which we must be prepared to respond; in light of the most dramatic changes in weaponry the world has ever seen—changes which must affect the relative vulnerability of every portion of our Armed Forces; and, in light of changes elsewhere in our own defense capabilities—changes which must have some effect upon the division of responsibility among all of our armed services.

Like the advocates of the horse cavalry and the battleship, the proponents of the carrier have looked first to the maintenance of an existing force level and only then to reasons which would justify this level.

It is for such reasons—reasons which I shall further elaborate upon—that Senator CASE and I have decided we cannot simply support the requested authorization for another nuclear attack carrier, contained in the current military authorization bill. This authorization now calls for $377.1 million for laying the keel of the carrier CVAN–69—the second of three planned *Nimitz*-class nuclear carriers. The first of these carriers is almost completed, and the third is programed for fiscal year 1971 funds.

We have introduced an amendment which would withhold this authorization, pending a complete congressional review of the Navy's attack carrier force level.

This is not an "anti-carrier" amendment, as Navy spokesmen would have us believe. Our amendment in no way suggests that the attack carrier is obsolete or has no viable role in the U.S. Navy.

The purpose of the amendment is to generate a rationale for the number and type of carriers required by present and future defense contingencies. Such a rationale has long been requested but never been provided by the Navy or the Defense Department. Instead, they have reacted to our questions by arguing the irrelevant issue of "carrier versus no carriers" and have ignored the far more difficult issue of the proper size and composition of the carrier fleet.

The wisdom of a new attack carrier and the wisdom of a continuing force level of 15 attack carriers must depend upon several things. It must depend upon the cost of carrier task forces—money which, if used for carriers, is not then available for other defense needs—not to mention other domestic needs.

It must depend upon the effectiveness of carrier-based air power—an effectiveness which, in turn, is greatly influenced by the carrier's vulnerability in various types of conflicts.

And, the wisdom of the current policy depends upon the capabilities of land based air power, which the carrier is designed to complement.

The fact is, the Navy has simply failed to justify in these terms the continuing need for a 15-carrier fleet.

This blind adherence to a force level is symptomatic of the failure to formulate a clear and consistent naval policy since the end of World War II. If the United States has a naval policy at all, Dr. Herrington noted:

> It is one of maintaining constant force levels and adapting these forces to the exigencies of the day.

COST OF PRESENT CARRIER PROGRAM

Such a nonpolicy is indefensible in light of the enormous costs of maintaining a fleet of 15 carriers. The Navy itself concedes that this fleet accounts for 40 percent of its total budget.

The cost of building an attack carrier rose from about $83 million in World War II to $171 million during the Korean war; the total construction cost for the nuclear carrier in this bill is pegged at $510 million, but a Defense Department official and others have estimated that it could run as high as $700 million. That amounts to a cost escalation of 600 percent since World War II, which is quite high even considering the decreased value of the dollar.

But the cost of the carrier itself is just the beginning of the story. The Navy only operates the carrier with a task force, consisting of various escort and logistical ships. And every carrier is equipped with an air wing.

The Navy estimates a $1.4 billion procurement cost for a nuclear carrier task force—consisting of the carrier and four destroyer escorts. The air wing costs an additional $409.5 million—bringing the total procurement cost for the task force—which does not include operating costs, basing costs, and other logistical ships—to $1.8 billion. Needless to say, these costs will often run a great deal higher.

But even this is not a complete picture. For the Navy normally deploys two task forces "on station" in the Mediterranean and three in the western Pacific on a continual basis. For every carrier task force "on station," two must be held in reserve as backups, since the normal rotation time of a carrier is 4 months. Since each task force contains an air wing, the Navy must pay for three wings to keep one "on station."

The Navy can operate at a higher rate of efficiency but only with great stress to the carrier's crew. The investment cost of maintaining one nuclear task force on continual deployment, therefore, amounts to a multiple of 3 times the cost of one carrier task force—or $5.4 billion.

The question of the proper attack carrier force level is therefore extremely important. For if it is determined that a smaller force level is needed, we will not only save the cost of additional carriers, but the cost as well, of numerous escorts, support ships, and air wings.

These costs dramatically illustrate the need for justifying a policy which insists on maintaining at least 15 attack carriers. But what is the origin of this number?

ORIGIN OF CURRENT FORCE LEVEL

It is generally thought that the force level of 15 carriers originated with the Washington Naval Disarmament Treaty of 1921. This treaty allotted 15 "capital ships" to the U.S. Navy. When the battleship became virtually obsolete in World War II, the carrier became the captial ship, and the Navy switched from a fleet of 15 battleships to one of 15 carriers.

Since the end of the Second World War, the Navy has maintained, with few exceptions, a fleet of at least 15 attack carriers. This number has been exceeded in only 5 of these years.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD table XIV, "Active Carrier Force, 1946–64, Attack Carriers or Their Early Equivalents," which I earlier introduced in my colloquy with the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK).

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE XIV.—ACTIVE CARRIER FORCE (1946–64) (ATTACK CARRIERS OR THEIR EARLY EQUIVALENTS)[1]

Year	Atlantic/ Mediterranean	Pacific	Total
1946	7	11	18
1947	9	6	15
1948	7	5	12
1949	7	5	12
1950	9	2	11
1951	9	6	15
1952	10	7	17
1953	9	9	18
1954	9	8	17
1955	7	10	17
1956	6	9	15
1957	6	8	14
1958	6	9	15
1960	6	9	15
1961	6	9	15
1962	6	9	15
1963	6	9	15
1964	6	9	15

[1] See app. A for complete listing of carrier force by ship type.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this table was prepared by Dr. Wilson, with an effective, and I think searching, analysis of the attack carrier by him. In it

he states the accurate equivalents of carrier force levels since 1946 and it comes out exactly to 15 as a modal figure. The Navy has developed some of its own figures in which it tries to show a wide and greatly varying figure year by year.

The truth of it is that Dr. Wilson's thesis has established beyond doubt that since the end of World War II we have followed a 15 capital ship policy without ever justifying the basis for that number. That is the only reason we continue that force level. If there are other reasons, the Navy has not seen fit to submit them to me or, to my knowledge, to anyone else in the Senate. In response to that question they say, "We are studying it."

Mr. President, it is evident that this number "15" is a legacy of the past, maintained without reference to the changing role of the carrier, the changing international situation, or the changing weapons against which the carrier must defend itself. The advocates of 15 attack carriers—like their predecessors who defended the horse cavalry and the battleship—are following a path of tradition rather than reason.

After World War II, the attack carrier—indeed, the entire Navy—became a force in search of a mission. There were no other surface fleets to engage, and the very existence of the Navy was threatened by the competition of new long range aircraft capable of delivering nuclear payloads. The Navy responded to these events by seeking justification for the attack carrier in strategic nuclear warfare. It appeared to the Navy planners that if the carrier task force was to survive as a major offensive weapon, it would have to get into the business of strategic bombing.

With the advent of land and sea-based missiles such as the Minuteman and the Polaris in the early 1960's, the carrier no longer had any role as part of our nuclear retaliation forces. The Defense Department's posture statement of February 4, 1964, concluded that by 1966, the United States would "have a large enough number of strategic missiles in place" to relieve the carrier forces of their strategic retaliatory mission.

Faced with the loss of their strategic retaliatory role, the Navy began to emphasize the carrier's potential tactical role in providing air support for ground troops, maintaining air superiority, and destroying supply lines. However, the argument that 15 attack carrier task forces is needed to provide sea-based tactical air power throughout the world is not a persuasive one, in view of these changing circumstances.

LAND- VERSUS CARRIER-BASED AIRPOWER

It is true that where land-based airpower is not immediately available or where political constraints limit the use of land bases, the carrier may well serve as a complement to our overseas bases. But where the carrier clearly competes with, rather than complements, land-based airpower, the role of the carrier must be justified on the basis of its effectiveness and its efficiency.

On these criteria, the maintenance of 15 carrier task forces for the provision of tactical air support around the world appears to be both wasteful and ineffective. In the first place, the sustained use of the carrier sorties duplicates and overlaps existing and potential U.S. capability for providing land-based tactical airpower.

Carrier task forces are assigned to the two major "trouble areas" of the world—nine are available for the Western Pacific and six for the Mediterranean. But it is quite clear that our capacity to deploy land-based tactical airpower is more than adequate in these areas as well as in most other parts of the globe where peace or U.S. interests may be threatened.

The U.S. Air Force maintains 23 wings of tactical fighters and bombers in active forces at home and abroad.

The geographic spread of overseas bases either operated by, or available to, the United States gives us an impressive land-based tactical capability, especially in the Mediterranean and the Western Pacific. In Europe, the United States alone—not including NATO forces—has bases in six countries, with over 400 tactical aircraft; at least four of those bases are within striking distance of the Mediterreanean. In the Pacific, we have bases in seven countries, with over 800 tactical aircraft.

Furthermore, our capacity for creating new land bases as needs arise is almost limitless. There are at least 1,000 overseas civilian airfields which the Air Force, within 3 days time, claims it can convert to a fully equipped tactical air base using the "pre-positioned kits" of the bare base support program.

These existing and potential bases do not tell the full story of the effectiveness of our land-based tactical air forces. The range of modern tactical aircraft is between two and three times greater than that of the older jets.

Mr. President (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair), I refer again to the letter, which I have already inserted in the RECORD, in which the Air Force asserts the capability of land-based air in Europe and Southeast Asia to meet any defense contingencies.

Mr. President, Secretary McNamara, in calling for a reduced carrier fleet, pointed out in the Defense Department's February 1964 posture statement that—

> The increasing range of land-based tactical aircraft has reduced our requirement for forward-based airpower.

This increased range is expanded even further by the use of midair refueling. Consequently, our overseas land-based planes are capable of reaching many more targets than they were even 10 years ago; and U.S.-based tactical aircraft can be operational anywhere in the world in a short period of time.

The Navy contends that the reduction in the number of our bases justifies the need for a 15-carrier fleet. While these bases have decreased from 119 in 1957 to 47 at the present time, the number of tactical air wings has increased from 16 to 23 during the same period. More important, the greatly increased range of these planes—both in the United States and overseas—means that far fewer land bases can provide ample tactical air support in any areas of potential conflict. And the bare base support program enables the United States to supplement existing land bases to the extent that it is necessary to do so. Even with fewer overseas land bases, then, carriers still overlap and duplicate our land-based capability.

More important than overlap alone, however, is the vastly greater cost of carrier-based airpower. As I explained earlier, the enormous initial expense of a single aircraft carrier is multiplied by the Navy's insistence upon an accompanying task force for defense and for logistical support. Added to this is the fact that to maintain a single carrier base requires three task forces and three air wings in rotation. This brings the investment cost of deploying one carrier base—with nuclear carriers and escorts—to $5.4 billion.

A land base is a far cheaper operation. According to the Air Force, a base in the Pacific can be built for $53 million; the bare base support program can convert an existing civilian runway for about $36 million.

The Air Force has indicated that many of them can be set up and made operational in 3 days.

We had an earlier discussion about the Defense Department's classification system. This is one of the areas where I believe the present policy is to be seen in its starkest dimensions, because one of the key questions in this debate, one of the key questions in this amendment, is what is the relative cost of land-based versus sea-based air, where they are equally available? That is one of the key questions. It has already been adverted to by Senators who oppose this amendment.

I have been advised secretly of information, which I cannot disclose, which shows the scandalously higher cost for sea-based over land-based air, but I am not permitted to use that information. I am not permitted to use it in defense of this amendment, even though it exists, and primarily because the Navy knows that if it were known it would hurt its case. I think that this classification has been made more because of political embarrassment and to maintain the 15 active carrier force than to protect us from having the enemy get that information.

One of the reasons why the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and I are proposing this amendment is that a fight of this kind is an unequal one, and we need to have resources and facilities in the Senate itself that permit us to get the information we must have to make intelligent choices in this field.

I make the statement I have made because I believe it is as far as I can go under the present classification system; but if we knew, as Senators in this body, what I have seen and have been told, the issue of cost effectiveness would be put to rest once and for all, and decisively so.

The high cost of carrier-based airpower must be viewed in relation to its effectiveness. The Navy has failed to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of carrier airpower.

For example, we know that the two carrier task forces "on station" in the Mediterranean are capable of providing a maximum of 150 offensive sorties per day. But what is the military significance of this number of sorties? Since we are flying almost 1,000 offensive sorties per day in Vietnam, it is clear that 150 sorties would only be of marginal value in a conflict of similar size in the Mediterranean. Given this fact, it is important to determine whether the Navy's policy of continually maintaining a certain number of carriers on station is worth the costs.

The reliance upon carrier rather than land-based airpower is made even more questionable by the high degree of vulnerability of the carrier in light of modern weaponry. Carriers are vulnerable to attacks by submarines, aircraft, ship-to-ship and air-to-ship missiles.

Submarines pose a particularly ominous threat to carriers. Because of the very rudimentary nature of antisubmarine warfare, there is very little a carrier can do to defend itself adequately from submarine attacks. The Navy has acknowledged in congressional testimony that one of the primary missions of the large Soviet submarine fleet is anticarrier warfare.

Rapid technological innovations in missile development have made the carrier unusable in all but the most limited conflicts. The lethal nature of even the older missiles, such as the Soviet STYX, was recently demonstrated when an Egyptian PT boast sunk an Israeli destroyer with a single STYX. Both the Soviet and the American arsenals contain far more advanced antiship missiles, with greater range and higher speed.

Once again, the basic material is classified, and probably wisely so; but it is fair to say that modern missilery raises profound doubts concerning the vulnerability of the modern attack carrier.

Unique to the Soviet inventory, according to the Chief of Naval Operations, is the guided cruise missile. The Navy estimates that 16 percent of the Soviet fleet carry 400 nautical mile cruise missiles designed primarily for use against land or sea targets.

In his testimony before the Senate Armed Forces Committee, Secretary of the Navy John H. Chaffee spoke of "the wide scope and gravity" of the missile threat to our surface fleet:

> In an effort to counter the surface forces, the Soviet Union is developing the capabilities of the terminal-homing cruise missile which may be launched from aircraft, surface units, surfaced submarines, or land sites, at short or long ranges . . . our capability to defend against a cruise missile attack continues to concern us, but we are moving forward with programs directed toward significant long-term improvements.

I would like to ask that special emphasis be placed upon the Secretary's own admission in this field when we hear the arguments, as I am sure we will, that the carrier is invulnerable.

It is not that the carrier is completely defenseless against these threats. Rather, the ever-present fear of enemy attack causes the carrier task force to concentrate its resources on defense, thereby substantially reducing its offensive capability. This idea was best expressed in a 1966 dissertation on attack carriers by Desmond Wilson, now at the Center for Naval Analysis. In Dr. Wilson's words:

> Most of the carriers' usefulness when functioning in support of a land campaign during a limited war appears to be significant only under conditions of little or no submarine opposition. It is a matter of some doubt that the carrier force could continue providing combat sorties in support of a land campaign if the task force commander had to worry about air or submarine attacks.

As Wilson observed, effectiveness of the carrier task forces in limited war is closely related to the problem of vulnerability, which, in turn, is conditioned by the rules or limits by which the war will be fought. Threats of escalation, such as the introduction of submarines or aircraft, can diminish carrier effectiveness: By forcing carriers to stay far at sea, thus diminishing the fuel available to the aircraft for combat purposes, and, by requiring continual movement of the carriers from area to area, thereby preventing it from staying in one locale to provide continual air support.

Mr. President, I understand the time has now come to recess for the funeral services. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to resume my speech at the commencement of the session this afternoon.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wonder if the Senator would ask that the Senator from Mississippi have unanimous consent to follow him for 20 minutes.

Mr. MONDALE. We had left that on an informal basis. I propose to do so. I wanted to see what would happen with the colloquy, but I propose to do so at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota will resume the floor at the conclusion of the recess.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there will be a recess at 11:45 a.m., at which time Senators will assemble to go to the rotunda, to be present when the body of the late and beloved minority leader, Everett McKinley Dirksen, will be removed. Senators who wish to attend the church services at 1 o'clock will assemble on the Senate steps at 12:15.

I shall now put in a quorum call, with the expectation of calling off the quorum call at 11:45, at which time the Senate will recess.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. For the information of the Senate, we will very likely be back in session somewhere between 2 and 2:15 this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GRAVEL in the chair).

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief quorum call without interfering with the rights of the able Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) under the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 471. An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108); and

H.J. Res. 247. A joint resolution relating to the administration of the national park system.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H.R. 471. An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108); and

H.J. Res. 247. A joint resolution relating to the administration of the national park system.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. MONDALE. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I strongly support the pending amendment offered by the distinguished Senators from New Jersey and Minnesota. I favor that we do withhold the expenditure of the $377 million authorized in the military authorization bill for a proposed additional nuclear aircraft carrier until the Congress has completed a comprehensive study and investigation of the need for building an additional attack carrier.

In my opinion, Mr. President, this proposed huge carrier is just as obsolete now and will be more obsolete in future years as much as was the battleship some time back. But, of course, the big brass in the Navy did not appreciate that and did not believe it. They were proved wrong.

Over the years, it has become clear that our military and naval leaders are among the last to accept changes in the nature of warfare in this space age of change and challenge. For example, we continued to add battleships to the fleet long after it was obvious to all intelligent persons in the United States that they were ineffective and uneconomical in the age of the nuclear submarine. The fact is that the aircraft carrier is no longer part of our strategic nuclear forces. Our ICBM's, Polaris and Poseidon submarines, and land-based SAC bombers form our real deterrent force.

The best defense of the United States at this time is the power of our Polaris submarines capable of roaming beneath the surface of the seven seas for as long as 300 days and nights, capable of firing nuclear warheads and striking targets in an enemy country at a distance of 2,875 miles.

The primary mission of aircraft carriers today is to provide tactical air power. We now have 15 attack carriers, each requiring a task force of escort and supply ships. It is estimated that one nuclear carrier task force, consisting of a carrier and four destroyers, costs taxpayers more than $1.4 billion. Also, as the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), who has made extensive research and devoted a great deal of time to the subject, has pointed out, to keep one such task force on station in normal times involves maintaining two complete task forces in reserve. Therefore, the real cost of placing one carrier task force on station is approximately $4.2 billion. This is luxury that our economy and taxpayers can no longer afford. It would be an unjustified extravagance.

Neither the Soviet Union nor Communist China is building a single attack aircraft carrier. There are no indications that either plan to do so. It is a fact that the Soviet Union is rapidly building up its naval strength, but it is doing so in keeping with the realities of the nuclear age. The main emphasis is placed on nuclear submarines and other smaller more maneuverable vessels by the astute leaders of the Soviet Union. Great Britain and France are the only other nations with attack carriers in their fleets. The British have announced their decision to phase out their carriers.

At a time when the United States maintains approximately 138 squadrons of tactical fighters and bombers on land bases at home and abroad, it is unconscionable and wasteful to maintain at the same time 15 aircraft carrier task forces. An average airbase in the Pacific area costs $53 million. It accomplishes the same purpose as a carrier task force costing $4.2 billion. Furthermore, with modern midair refueling techniques, our tactical air power can be operational in a very short period of time regardless of where it may be needed.

The large, modern carriers are effective only in very limited conflicts and situations. They are extremely vulnerable to destruction by submarines, aircraft, ship-to-ship missiles and air-launched missiles. Almost one-half of the cost of a carrier task force is for defensive purposes.

It is high time that our admirals recognize and accept the realities of present and future defense needs. They seem to ignore the availability and the comparable effectiveness of land-based aircraft. Not only is there no need whatever for additional carriers, but there is no reason why the Navy cannot reduce the present number of the fleet.

Mr. President, the $377.1 million requested for the proposed CVAN–69 nuclear aircraft carrier is merely the downpayment for what will eventually be an expenditure of $4.2 billion of taxpayers' money. I am hopeful that the Senate will agree to the pending amendment, authored by the Senator from Minnesota, who just yielded to me, to prevent that expenditure until the Congress has had the opportunity to complete its study and investigation of past and projected costs and the effectiveness of attack aircraft carriers and their task forces.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his excellent statement and, if I may say so, for his leadership, much earlier, in this field. He was one of the first in the Senate, some time back, to raise the question whether, in the light of modern realities, it was wise to continue at our present attack aircraft carrier levels or whether that policy should be reviewed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I will be glad to yield in a little while.

The Senator from Ohio underscores the importance of having systems that are modern and relevant, not to World War II or to World War I, but, tragically, to the next war which we will have to fight if it is necessary to do so.

Referring to what one military historian said, military history is studded with institutions which have managed to dodge the challenge of the obvious; and one of the reasons why they have been able to do so in this country is that we in Congress have not done our job as well as we should. The job Congress is required to do under the Constitution is to raise and maintain the Army and the Navy. It is our responsibility under the Constitution. I am hopeful that in this amendment, and in other ways, we can begin to assert our traditional, and almost sacred, responsibility in this field.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for his contribution, not only today but in the past.

I now yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. In my study of this problem, it is my understanding that the carrier to be authorized by the bill before us, which the Senator's amendment seeks to delete, will be capable of handling the F–14, but that the *Essex*-type carrier—which this newly authorized carrier will replace—not only will not handle the F–14, but also not serve the F–4, or the RA–5C, the A–6, or the F–14. There are four of the carrier-based planes that cannot be landed upon this obsolete type of aircraft carrier. It was valid in World War II but is no longer capable of dealing with these new aircraft.

If the Senator's amendment is adopted, what are we going to do with the F–14?

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his question. The truth of it is that at least 10, and possibly 13, of the 15 carriers can handle the current aircraft which the Navy has, and could handle the F–14 when completed, if it is authorized.

If the Senator would review the remarks by the Chief of Naval Operations in which he recounted to us the wars and near wars in which we have been involved since 1946, he would find that at least half of those wars were against "major" powers like Zanzibar.

It seems to me when we look at the question of the carrier force, we must look at it not only in terms of numbers but of the mix. To send a $1.8 billion nuclear-powered force to show our flag off Haiti, for example, seems to me the greatest waste of money. So we might wisely ask what kind of attack force we need.

What we are asking is not to strike the authorization for the carrier, but to ask, what kind of carrier force level we need, what kinds we need, and what the purpose will be.

The same questions we are asking today are the questions that were asked in the executive branch and in the National Security Council. That is all we are doing. We are not asking to pass on the merits. We are asking questions which should have been asked a long time ago as to where we can save money and avoid waste where it exists. That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STEVENS. I did review a statement made by Admiral Moorer, Chief of Naval Operations, the one which was made to the Veterans of Foreign Wars last month. He pointed out that the Soviet Union had quadrupled its merchant marine tonnage since 1950, and, even further, in the warship area, that 60 percent of the warships on which we based our advance strategy had passed the 20-year mark, whereas, of the Soviet Union's 1,000 or more navy or surface ships that they relied on, less than one-fourth had passed the 20-year mark.

My question to the Senator from Minnesota is that it was my understanding that this matter had been studied—it was studied in 1968, before I got here, and it

was studied particularly by Secretary McNamara who requested this building program—are we annually to get to the point where we ask for a delay? Having had a review by the executive branch and by the Congress, are we now to come up the next year and say, "Let us delay it for a year so we can study it again?" What new matters have entered into the matter which the executive branch and the Congress studied that require the review that he suggests at this time?

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad the Senator has raised the question for, as a matter of fact, after writing the Navy Department, there came a letter which says it is studying the issue of national security and is making a sweeping review of the traditional arms of the Navy and the Navy aircraft carrier and Navy aircraft carrier levels.

But even the Navy and the Department of Defense have said in writing that this matter should be, and it is being, studied. As a matter of fact, I know that it is; and it may be that as we meet here today, these recommendations are being submitted to the National Security Council.

Furthermore, I am glad that the Senator from Alaska brought up the former Secretary of Defense, because in 1964 he testified that he wanted a reduced level of aircraft carriers for the early 1970's. So the recommendation of the past Secretary of Defense, as well as the recommendations which are classified by the present systems analysis group this year, have called for reductions in the aircraft carrier level, and there has been a good deal of speculation, albeit not confirmed, that this administration is planning to cut two or three aircraft carriers from its force.

So there is plenty of inside, official consideration being given to that, and it would seem very strange that in the midst of all this, the one agency that the Constitution charges with establishing and maintaining the Army and Navy would sit back and simply continue to appropriate billions of dollars for a system that is under study. I think we can afford to take a few months and make certain we are acting wisely.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one last question?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. STEVENS. My last question is this: In my study, I have found that we have already obligated, in 1968 and 1969, after the time that the previous review took place, some $132.9 million for this carrier. I am informed that if a disruption of the production schedule comes about by virtue of this amendment, it will probably cost us in the neighborhood of $100 million to delay this carrier.

If that is correct, the total cost of the Senator's amendment would be approximately $232 million, as opposed to the total cost of a carrier under the program that was previously authorized, with the idea that the new carrier and the F–14 would come on the line at the same time.

Is this really wise use of our Treasury, the taxpayers' money, if we make a decision in Congress to go ahead with the construction of a new carrier, and spend the money, order the vessel, and then, a year later, come along with an amendment to delete this new carrier?

I understand we have an amendment pending to delete the F–14 also. But how can the Senator justify the spending of $132 million, if my information is correct, that has already gone by the board, and the $100 million additional that will be brought about by the disruption of the production schedule? In view of the total cost of the carrier itself, why not go ahead with the carrier?

Mr. MONDALE. In the revised amendment which I called up yesterday, and which is the pending business, we made one alteration to correct a technical error in the original amendment, to make it clear that this amendment applies only to moneys authorized to be appropriated under this act, not the earlier $130 million to which the Senator's argument makes reference.

Based on the earlier amendment, the Senator is correct; based on the amendment as revised, it is no longer relevant.

Of course, the big issue today is not whether a few million dollars will be lost, as we determine whether we are pursuing the wisest course and the wisest force levels. I regret any losses; but what we are talking about here is a nuclear attack carrier which, with its nuclear escorts and wings, will cost at least $1.8 billion, and could well be $2 billion, and a policy which involves 40 percent of the budget of the Navy. Certainly, a few days spent wisely determining these matters could save billions of dollars. If I may say so, it is a standard tactic of the Defense Department to buy long lead items, and then come in and say:

> It is too late to decide the policy matters underlying this system, because we have already spent a few million dollars; let's not get into it.

Mr. STEVENS. But as I understand the justification of this program, this is just replacing an existing carrier; it will not add to the carrier fleet.

Mr. MONDALE. The present policy of the Navy, as I understand it, is to retire one of the old World War II type carriers for every one of these massive new nuclear carriers. But that is not holding to the same military capacity; it is doubling it, because one of these old World War II type carriers had, at best, half the capacity of the new nuclear attack carriers. We are not pursuing a neutral, hold-the-line policy. Our present policy is to commit an ever-increasing share of the Navy's contribution to this Nation's defense on an ever-growing fleet of aircraft carriers.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I yield for one question; then I wish to return to my speech.

Mr. MURPHY. Does the Senator understand they are going to retire one carrier as they build one new carrier?

Mr. MONDALE. That is my understanding.

Mr. MURPHY. Then the Senator's implication is that they will have increased, actually, the carrier force?

Mr. MONDALE. No, my implication——

Mr. MURPHY. My understanding is that there are several carriers presently being used that are so old they should have been retired some time ago. As a matter of fact, last Saturday morning I saw two carriers in Long Beach, Calif., that are to be retired; and it is my understanding that the nuclear carrier, by the time it is constructed, fitted, and furnished, will just barely, if actually, maintain the present strength. That was the purpose of my question.

I thank my distinguished colleague.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I should like to respond to the question of the Senator from California, and I am willing to respond to one or two more questions, but I am only half-way through my speech, and would like to complete it, if I may.

In my later remarks, I intend to get into this matter. I asked the Navy if there were some shorthand way that one could refer to the capacity of these aircraft carriers, and it turns out that they have developed what they call an A–4 equivalent, which measures roughly the capacity of each of these carriers.

They rate the old *Hancock* class carrier, which is one of those scheduled for replacement by the new nuclear carrier, at 83, and the *Nimitz*-class nuclear carriers, which are at issue here, at 152—not quite two to one in terms of capacity, but nearly so.

I am happy now to yield first to the Senator from Virginia, and then to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I mention this point just for purposes of clarification.

In the Senator's colloquy with the Senator from Alaska, he very accurately brought out that in 1964, Secretary of Defense McNamara recommended a reduction in the number of carriers.

Mr. MONDALE. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. But I think, so that the record may be complete and accurate, it should show that subequent to that, in 1968, I believe it was, or 1967, Secretary McNamara strongly recommended the building of three new nuclear carriers.

Mr. MONDALE. Yes; and the two statements may be consistent.

In other words, while I do not have his testimony before me, he may have contemplated that each of the new nuclear attack carriers, which are being built in the State of the Senator from Virginia, may in fact replace not one but two of the older carriers, so that, while we are attaining the new nuclear attack carriers the total carrier attack force level, in terms of numbers of carriers, would be reduced.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senator is correct. I interrupted him at this point only so that the record could show that the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, recommended that the carrier now under discussion be built.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I understand that the

Senator has not finished his speech, and I certainly do not wish to detain him on that. As the Senator knows, I have in mind asking for about 20 minutes, at least, when he has finished; but I want to respond, if I may, quite briefly about this carrier-force level, and simply say this: that of the 16 carriers in operation now, number 16 is extra because of the war, and it is to come out, as the Senator knows, as soon as possible, and not count as the carrier reduction that this will cover.

The Navy has the very definite position that they will take out of operation carrier No. 15, I will call it.

I have conferred with Admiral Moorer, who is, I think, one of the ablest and frankest men in the military. I am one who will not disbelieve what military men tell me and not believe it just because they wear uniforms. They are in trustworthy positions. Until I know to the contrary, I would trust them on these direct, major questions.

Who knows what our conditions will be when the carrier provided for in the pending bill is completed? If anyone knows that, then he can give an accurate estimate about what we will do about the carriers and how many we will take out.

I have pressed for an answer on this. It is going to be reviewed and ought to be reviewed by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Chief of Naval Operations, and everyone else, including Congress, in a position of responsibility as to how many will continue to be operated.

I think there is a very fine chance that by the time this carrier is completed, an additional one, carrier No. 14, will come out of the fleet. I hope so. I hope that even more of them will come out of the fleet. However, I think there is a high probability, with the added capacity that the Senator has already mentioned, that it will be entirely possible to take an additional carrier out of the fleet.

I do not think we can argue with any success at all now as to definitely how many carriers we will need in 1972 or 1973.

As we remember, we built airbases in France. We helped to provide hundreds of millions of dollars to build and construct those airbases. Now, we cannot use those bases or even fly across France without a day-to-day permit, as I understand it. That is the kind of world in which we are living.

I had the experience of being in French Morocco. We were there looking very closely at the bases. A bystander told me, "You will never use these bases for more than a short time."

I said, "Why?"

He said, "French Morocco will get its independence and run you out of here."

That is exactly what happened 2½ years later. That is the kind of world in which we live.

I think the Senator from Minnesota has a very fine statement here. However, the matter concerning the number we need rests with the gods.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I was quite encouraged by the statement he made the other day in which he expressed the hope, and repeated it this afternoon, that when the next nuclear carrier is completed, we might displace not only one but, he hoped, more than one. I was encouraged by that statement because I think that may well be one of the possible results of this amendment.

One of the problems I have had in seeking to deal responsibly with the amendment is the remarkable degree of difference that exists between the Navy and the Air Force when each one of them describes the effectiveness of its own tactical airpower and its own bases and equipment.

The Senator from Mississippi quite correctly states that he does not disbelieve a person because he is in the Navy or wears a uniform. I agree with that statement. However, in this case we have a letter which I had printed in the RECORD earlier today in which the Air Force said in response to a question from the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) that we have enough land bases in all of Europe and Southeast Asia to meet all of the tactical air needs of any contingency which the Joint Chiefs have considered.

We are all aware that one of the chief uses of the aircraft in Vietnam has been the bombing of North Vietnam which we have since stopped.

Certainly the fact that aircraft were once used for functions which are no longer required ought to be some justification for lowering the task force level in that area.

The fact is, the National Security Council of the Defense Department right now, as the Senator from Mississippi knows, is undertaking, and may have completed, a sweeping review of the general purpose of the force level.

I am not content—and I am sure the Senator from Mississippi would agree with me—to let the matter of the defense spending level of this country or the wisdom of every expenditure rest in the exclusive domain of the executive branch. I have been around long enough to believe that it would be an unwise policy.

Mr. STENNIS. I will develop my idea and my argument about the level of the carriers on my own time. However, I do want to point out that I have never been and never will be a party to the argument between the Air Force and the Naval air arm as to how much the other one needs. I will never be a party to that. I have never had any patience with it. I do not now.

We need both of them in a supplemental way. And we need them very badly.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my remarks, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) be recognized for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It was not possible for me to be present at the beginning of the address being made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

I was back in my State last night and part of this morning and was impressed by the fact a great many of the programs considered essential in our cities, our suburbs, and the rural districts of our country are drying up because of lack of funds.

It has been my lot to be associated at least indirectly with the defenses of the United States for some 50 years, and directly in this town for over a quarter of a century.

I have watched weapons systems come and go. The RECORD will show that as a Senator at no time have I criticized the use, development, or number of aircraft carriers. But I have seen the death of the battleship. That all started when the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* were sunk by some old Japanese planes off the coast of Malaysia; and continued when the *Bismarck*, after sinking the greatest battleship ever built, up to that time, was destroyed by a few old Fairey planes off an old British carrier, the *Wasp*.

It happened I was flying militarily from England to Portugal at that time—the spring of 1941—and ran into that particular fight, which thereupon also ended the concept of the large battle cruiser.

There was a time when many of us were convinced that the new strategic bomber, the B–70, was needed for the security of the United States. It is a matter of record that the B–70 was voluntarily abandoned by the Air Force, when the latter changed from the B–70 to the RS–70. At that time I left the boat, primarily because of the great development of ground-to-air missiles by the possible enemy.

For years efforts have been made to ascertain the true cost of a carrier task force; and also it is true now that we have this tremendous development in missiles, a development which is increasing in momentum rather than decreasing; it is vital that this system be examined.

Now the Senator says in his talk that the mission of the carrier, because of the development of these missiles, in effect has been changed from a strategic mission to a tactical mission. That is worthy of most serious consideration.

For the first time since World War II we are really discussing, in detail, a weapons system that never before was discussed in detail. I am not saying that we should adopt or reject this amendment, but I am saying that it is not only the right, it is also the duty of the Senate to consider this system as it considers all other weapons systems and problems of defense procurement that come before the Senate. There should be nothing inviolate, nothing sacred, about any weapons system; because, in the end, it is the taxpayer of the United States who is going to pay for it.

I respectfully commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for bringing this matter up in such detail before the Senate.

There have been sharp and basic developments in warfare in recent years, and without question the greatest development has been in the missile field. Missiles are air to sea, sea to sea, and ground to sea, just as they are ground

to air and sea to air, and ground to ground.

The Mediterranean situation is one of particular interest to me, because my Foreign Relations Subcommittee has to do with that part of the world. A great many people have expressed new interest in, and concern about, the future of naval warfare because of the recent development of the Styx missile by the Soviet Union and the catastrophic result when it was used in an attack by the United Arab Republic in the Mediterranean.

I did not intend to make extended remarks on this subject, and look forward to listening to the able Senator from Minnesota. I do know, as does everyone in this Chamber, that this country must stay strong if it is to stay free. But it is our duty—and I believe the Senator from Minnesota is quite accurate when he says it is our duty—to discuss all weapons systems in detail. At other times I have opposed various systems in the other two branches of the services, but to the best of my knowledge, this is the first time I have ever given consideration to reducing a Navy system. Now we should examine in detail whether or not the addition of aircraft carriers is the right type and character of action in this missile age.

Somehow, in some way, we must cut the increasingly high cost of defense. If we do not, we will destroy the value of the dollar, and all that connotes also from the standpoint of the real future security of the United States.

It would be unfortunate if this discussion deteriorated at any time into a disagreement between one service and another—specifically, between the Air Force and the Navy. I would hope that does not develop. The Air Force may have too many bases abroad. So may the Navy, in this nuclear space missile, have too many bases in the form of carriers. Many bases were created and supported when the strategic bomber, Navy and Air Force, was dominant as the strongest strategic defense weapon of the United States. That is no longer the case. The Polaris is the greatest strategic weapon today.

All of us should worry about the fact that the strength of the Soviet Union in submarines is far greater than anything the Kaiser or Hitler ever had or the United States has today. We stick with the carriers while they now build an attack submarine force which is hundreds larger than ours. As they look toward modernity in weapons, however, they have not yet laid down a single carrier.

In any case the point I want to make is that it does not make any difference whether the tactical airpower of the Air Force is more important or more valuable or more desirable than the tactical airpower of the Navy, or whether the tactical airpower of the Navy is more desirable or more important than the tactical airpower of the Air Force. What is important is what is necessary for the security of the country. I would hope that many of these bases in these faraway lands, created to handle a type and character of warfare which will never occur again, are dismantled, so they will no longer be an additional burden on the American taxpayer.

I would hope we would look at all this not as rivalry between the services, rather as a possible way, manner method by which we can reduce the costs of Defense.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I shall respond shortly but I had promised that I would yield to the Senator from New Jersey. I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator. I have not previously joined in the discussion. I wish to say first how much I value this collaboration. It has been not only a satisfaction but also a very great pleasure to this point. My association with the Senator from Minnesota has increased my high regard for his ability. My participation in the discussions on these several amendments has also increased my regard for the Senator from Mississippi and the splendid way in which he has accommodated himself to what has been in many ways a very trying experience.

After working for months on this legislation in his committee he has had to deal with what I know has been a very trying series of amendments. To someone who has been over this ground many times already, perhaps it seems an unnecessary expenditure of time and energy on his part. However, for the good spirit he has shown in permitting us to continue what we think is our duty today I am most grateful. That was the reason I asked to be recognized.

I want the Senator from Missouri to recognize what we are attempting to do in this amendment, as in other amendments which have been and which will be offered to the bill. It is very helpful and encouraging that he has so fully accepted and so well stated what we think is the primary issue here: Shall Congress remain in control and, as some of us think, regain control of the basic decisions affecting national policy in the field of weaponry and large strategic matters?

It is our conviction, and my own very definitely, that we have not done our share of this in the past, we have not been organized to do it, and we have not regarded it as a function which we ought to perform. I can see no argument against our asking the Congress to do that job now.

I think that the matter of the carrier and several of these other strategic weapons systems are appropriate vehicles by which we can ask Congress to bring itself to this task. That is the purpose. We are not for or against this carrier, qua carrier, nor do we have any firm view as to the number of carriers, if any carriers there are to be in the armed services of the United States now and for the next 30 years. We do think Congress should take this opportunity to study that question, and that is the purport and purpose of our amendment.

I am grateful that someone so experienced in the operations of high policy in the defense of the United States should approve our effort and think it good.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator for yielding. My purpose in rising is to address a question to the Senator from Missouri.

I wish to say first that the views of the senior Senator from Missouri carry extraordinary weight with me on military matters because of his utterly unique background in this field, and because of his careful attention to the broadest strategic implications of these matters and the narrowest details in relation to tactics, costs, and so forth. His speech the other day on the C–5A had more to do with my opposing that amendment than any other single factor.

Having said that, I would like to ask the Senator if the remote presence concept has any relevance to the carriers? Does the existence of a substantial number of carriers specifically relate to this amendment? Is there any reason to believe that by supporting the carrier presently under consideration we might have a greater opportunity to cut back on troops stationed abroad?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I say to my able and distinguished friend, the Senator from California, that I deeply appreciate his kind but undeserved remarks.

His question gets into tactics.

The Mediterranean Sea today is a narrow lake from the standpoint of modern weaponry; in fact, for a time, after the Egyptians sank the Israel destroyer *Elath*, it was believed the missiles must have come from the land. The fact there was disagreement as to whether it came from sea or from the land is in itself interesting from the standpoint of the question posed by the able Senator from California. Some parts of the Mediterranean are but 7½ miles wide; therefore of course ships could be attacked from the land by missiles as well as from the sea and from the air.

We know how dangerous the Sam missiles were to our planes in the Vietnam theater. For example, unless by mistake, no B–52 ever went over North Vietnam. But that Sam-2 missile is obsolescent compared with modern air-to-ground missiles developed by the Soviet Union and passed out to their friends and allies.

A ground-to-air missile works against gravity but an air-to-air or air-to-ground missile has gravity working in its favor.

Today both the United States and the Soviet Union have underway missiles far more sophisticated than those Soviet Styx missiles which sank the *Elath*.

In reviewing the speech of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), I noticed the large proportion of our carrier task fleets that he says are assigned to the Mediterranean. At one time I worked for the late, great Secretary of Defense James Forrestal. He felt that the first person responsible for putting one enemy of the United States in the Mediterranean could be responsible for the first nail placed in the coffin of our security. Today the forces of possible enemies are spread all over the Mediterranean.

It is interesting to notice just how few

Mediterranean ports are now available to our fleet.

Perhaps the most dramatic development in the Mediterranean in recent months and years has been the growth of the Soviet fleet in that sea.

But even as of today they have not built a single carrier. They have a helicopter pad called the Moskua, but that is not a carrier. They also have a lot of submarines and cruisers and destroyers. If it is true, as the talk of the Senator from Minnesota brings out, that counting the backup, the money we have invested in the Mediterranean in carriers runs into many billions of dollars, as the development of the art of missilery continues, that would appear of the greatest importance in this discussion.

Is by chance this inland sea a trap to old concepts of weaponry in this missile age? If it is, should we not change our concept; or should we continue to handle it today as we did 25 years ago?

All countries that once built carriers have now discontinued building them, except the United States; and the country rising in naval power, all over the world—the Soviet Union—has never yet laid down a single carrier.

These are problems the Senator from Minnesota is bringing out on the floor of the Senate. The theory of "remote presence" is certainly designed to eliminate some Army and Air Force bases; and I would say to my good friend from California that this theory should also eliminate some Navy bases as exemplified by carriers.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his most useful and gifted discussion of this issue. I share the admiration of the Senator from California for the Senator from Missouri for his lifetime of interest in this subject, the unique experience which he brings to bear, and his devotion to his country and its best interests.

Would the Senator from Missouri say that while much of it is classified, it is fair to say that the Soviets have been making an intensive effort to develop the latest, most accurate, speediest, and most powerful missilery? Would there be any doubt about that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The proponents of the ABM system made this perhaps their chief argument in justification of that system. To the best of my knowledge, no one has questioned the fact that the Soviet Union was racing ahead in the missile field and attempting to equal, if not exceed, the position of the United States in that field.

Mr. MONDALE. Is it not correct that a good many of the currently deployed Soviet cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and airplanes have on them cruiser missiles of this kind?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is my understanding. The missiles which sank the *Elath* are now considered to have come from what was little more than a large motorboat. The sharpness of that attack, and its decisiveness, amazed various naval people with whom I talked. The launching ship was very small, and the missiles were made by the Soviet Union, and were effective.

Mr. MONDALE. As the Senator from Missouri has already said, the Styx missile is an old generation and certainly is not in the front ranks of the current state of the art as developed by the Soviet Union; is that not correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would answer my good friend that it probably does not go as far back as Sam, the Redstone, or the Thor, but it is a long, long way from what we are confident the Soviet Union has today; and what are our own plans and programs in this particular field.

Mr. MONDALE. As the Senator knows, the amendment—and we have to keep repeating this because it is being characterized in a very different way—is a very modest amendment. It would ask only that Congress ask the General Accounting Office to review the facts, the cost evaluation, and all the accounting data, and to pass this information on to Congress so that we can make some judgments as to the proper force level, the best use of our total defense budget, and the need at this time for a new nuclear attack carrier. That is all the amendment would do. As I understand the comments of the Senator from Missouri, this kind of study is not only valuable but long overdue.

I should like to make one final comment and then I should like to return to my speech.

The President made a statement about the spending level of the economy and asked some grave questions about the future value of the American dollar. We all agree that if we want to demoralize this country, erode the value of the dollar, and destroy the savings and pensions of millions and millions of Americans, all we have to do is continue to spend billions of dollars without first asking "why" or setting forth any priorities. Thus, as we look at the Nation's budget, every bit of it has to be analyzed, including the budget of the Department of Defense.

The other day, the President called certain people "unilateral disarmers." I think he might have had me in mind. I checked to see how much I had voted for in defense spending since I came to the Senate. I am a junior Member of this body and have been here for 5 years; that is two and one-half Congresses. I find that I voted for $289 billion worth of defense spending. That is direct spending—$289 billion—think of it. Does that make one a unilateral disarmer in the judgment of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, it is tiresome to have people put in the broad categories of hawks or doves just because they try to discriminate between all the weapons systems advanced instead of endorsing all said systems.

The two men who introduced the ABM amendment, one, the senior Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), enlisted in the U.S. Army as a private in the Second World War and came out an officer. The other sponsor, the senior Senator from Michigan, received his Purple Heart on Utah Beach on D-day.

One of the two Senators I joined in signing the ABM minority report of the Armed Services Committee was a decorated combat infantryman on the Anzio beachhead when he was over 50, the other, who left his right arm in Italy fighting for his country, received the finest citation I ever read, and the Distinguished Service Cross. Based on the citation, and what Gen. Mark Clark said about him to the Armed Services Committee, I still do not understand why he did not receive the Medal of Honor.

So talk of pacifism and unilateral disarmament on the part of certain Members gets a little tiresome.

I have been here longer than my able and respected colleague from Minnesota, and found out recently that I have worked for and voted for $953 billion for the security of the United States since coming into the Government. That means that by the end of this year the figure will be over $1 trillion. But just because one asks, not that a system be stopped, only deferred for additional development, he is labeled in some quarters as being antimilitary. What a farce.

I have great respect for the ultimate wisdom of the people of this country, who are watching the continuation of this sad and tragic venture in Vietnam; and because I have that respect, I believe none of us has cause for apprehension about such attacks.

It is both patriotic and constructive for the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New Jersey to bring this matter up for discussion. We have a right, as representatives of the people—all the people, no particular clique or caste—to ask: What is true security? Is it more important for our citizens to respect the wisdom of the leadership of the country in the expenditure of their money than to have a particular weapons system? Which is the more important? It would appear just as important to the security of the United States for us to have a sound economy as to have a particular weapons system.

Should we continue to pile armament onto armament as against continuing to make every effort to work for a just and honorable peace.

These are but a few of the questions being raised back home with respect to weaponry, on this carrier system as they have been raised on other systems. It is all constructive and I believe what the people expect of their representatives.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his most encouraging remarks and his keen interest in this issue.

James Field, a naval historian, noted that a carrier task force, in fear of enemy attacks, cannot successfully participate in a campaign of interdiction. He wrote that in Korea, for example, "Logistic considerations and the dangers of air and submarine attack made it undesirable for carriers to operate for more than 2 days in the same location."

Perhaps the most crucial limitation on the carrier's effectiveness is that the threat of attack diverts potentially offensive carrier sorties to defense of the task force. Thus, during World War II and the Korean war, 23 percent of the total combat sorties flown from carriers were defensive. This contrasts with 2.7

percent flown by planes from land bases during the Korean war.

Fears and uncertainties concerning an enemy's anticarrier warfare potential also affects the rapid responsiveness of the attack carrier, which is its strongest attribute. Wilson noted that uncertainties as to weapons, belligerents, and the limits of the war did in fact impede carrier deployment early in the Korean conflict. Future limited wars will also be surrounded by "uncertainties as to who will fight and with what weapons."

Because of the tremendous investment in a carrier and its task force and because of the recognition of the vulnerability of the carrier under certain conditions, the Navy is naturally hesitant to commit the carrier to a conflict or potential conflict. Once committed, the ever-present fear of enemy attack may prevent the carrier from serving as an effective sea base for tactical airstrikes.

It should be emphasized that the threats which have limited a carrier's responsiveness and effectiveness in past wars are far more dangerous today. And since naval doctrine, as Wilson points out, "as yet says nothing about treating the attack carrier as expendable in a limited war," there is every indication that the carrier will be even less effective in future conflicts with a sophisticated enemy.

The Navy, however, refuses to fully recognize the vulnerability of carriers. Its grandiose planning for the use of carriers illustrates this fact.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to comment upon the agreements by which the Navy has attempted to demonstrate the invulnerability of the aircraft carrier. I will quote from a speech of the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Moorer, who said at a recent Veterans of Foreign Wars convention:

> In some 50 wars or near wars since 1946, we have not lost a carrier or had one damaged owing to hostile action.

That is what he told the VFW in order to satisfy them that the attack carrier was no longer vulnerable.

I wrote the Chief of Naval Operations and asked, "Would you please provide me with a list of those wars or near wars that you based your invulnerability argument upon?"

After some 10 days, I received a document which, surprisingly, was classified. In it, he recounted not 50, but 48 wars or near wars in which the aircraft carrier had actually been involved or alerted.

In four of those wars or near wars, the aircraft carrier was not even there; it had just been alerted. We checked the names of the various wars or near wars, and asked the admiral to declassify them, so that the Senate could know the experiences, areas, and events in which the carrier has been involved during the past 23 years. Such a list would probably be the best indication of when, under what circumstances, and in what kind of challenges the naval attack carrier was used.

We received a partially declassified list. To be charitable to the Navy, I would say the most embarrassing incidents remain classified. But it is fair to say that at least half of these alleged wars or near wars were wars in which the carrier was only remotely involved, and against alleged enemies which had no capacity at all to inflict any kind of damage upon the attack carrier, even if they wanted to; and in most cases there is no evidence that they did.

I do not think that it says much about the invulnerability of the carrier in those incidents where the carrier was not involved, to say it was not sunk; or to say, when in about half the instances that he has listed in this message the enemy had no capacity to respond at all, or showed no intention of responding, that somehow the carrier survived and therefore is invulnerable.

The issue on vulnerability is an obvious one: Do modern missilery, aircraft, submarines, and other kinds of technology and weapons raise doubts as to the survivability of the attack carrier under certain instances and in certain kinds of wars? That is the issue, and I deeply regret that the Chief of Naval Operations would base his case for the invulnerability of the carrier by referring to a list of minor events and foreign riots in which no carrier was sunk or damaged.

I ask unanimous consent that the declassified version of the list of instances to which the admiral made reference be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF WARS, NEAR WARS SINCE 1946

(The following list represents only major/minor conflicts or crises where U.S. Naval units were involved as prime factors, alerted or redeployed.)

Turkey (4/46): USSR-Iran hostilities and USSR-Turkey diplomatic tensions; Naval unit deployed as affirmation of U.S. intentions to shore up Turks against Soviet imperialism.

Trieste (7/46): Trieste ownership dispute; U.S. and British Naval units dispatched to scene with open warfare imminent. Commenced Adriatic Patrol which lasted until Trieste issue resolved in 1954.

Greece (9/46): Political crisis. Naval Units visit requested by U.S. Ambassador.

Indochina War (11/46–7/54): Naval units employed in evacuation, assistance, alert status.

Israel (6/48–4/49): Naval units assigned UN mediator for the Palestine Truce. Evacuated UN team eventually in July.

Greek Civil War (46–49): Presence and alert.

Korea (50–53): Combat operations.

Tachens Crisis (7/54–2/55): Evacuation of civilians/military personnel; alert and operations.

Vietnam Guerrilla War (9/55–Present): Presence, assistance, combat operations.

Red Sea (2/56): Naval unit patrols established in view of developing Suez Crisis.

Jordan Tension (5/56): Provided presence.

Pre-Suez Tension (7/56): Alert.

Suez War (10–11/56): Alert, evacuation, provided presence.

Jordan Crisis (4/57): External conspiracy charged with intent to subvert Jordan. Naval units dispatched.

Kinmen Island (7/57): Communist shelling. Naval units dispatched to defend Taiwan.

Haiti Disorders (6/57): Alert, surface patrols.

Syria Crisis (8–12/57): Alert, provided presence.

Lebanon Civil War (5/58): Support operations.

Jordan/Iraq Unrest (8–12/58): Alert, surveillance, surface patrol.

Cuba Civil War (12/56–12/58): Alert, evacuation, provided presence.

Quemoy-Matsu Crisis (9–10/58): Evacuation, combat operations.

Panama Invasion (4/59): Provided presence.

Berlin Crisis (5–9/59): Alert, provided presence.

Nationalist China-Communist China Crisis (7/59): Provided presence.

Panama Demonstrations (8 & 11/59): Alert.

Laos Civil War (12/60–5/61): Alert, provided presence.

Congo Civil War (7/60–8/63): Alert, evacuation.

Caribbean Tension (4–12/60): Alert, air and surface patrols.

Guatemala-Nicaragua (11/60): Alert, air and surface patrols.

Bay of Pigs Crisis (5/61): Alert.

Zanzibar Riots (6/61): Alert.

Berlin Crisis (9/61–5/62): Alert, provided presence.

Dominican Republic (11–12/61): Alert, air and surface patrols.

Guantanamo Tension (1 and 7/62): Alert, provided presence.

Guatemala (3/62): Alert, provided presence.

Thailand (5/26): Alert, provided presence.

Quemoy-Matsu Crisis (6–62): Provided presence.

Cuban Missile Crisis (10–11/62): Provided presence and intervention.

Yemen Revolts (2–4/63): Alert, provided presence, surface patrols.

Laos Tension (4/63): Alert, provided presence.

Jordan Crisis (4/63): Alert, provided presence, surface patrols.

Caribbean Tensions (1963): Alert, air and surface patrols.

Vietnam Civil Disorders (8–9 and 10/63): Alert, air and surface patrols.

Dominican Republic (9/63): Alert.

South Vietnam Crisis (11/63): Following death of President Diem. Provided presence.

Indonesia-Malaysia (12/63): Alert, provided presence.

Panama (1–4/64): Alert, provided presence and evacuation.

Guantanamo Tensions (4–7/64): Provided presence, surface patrols.

Panama (5/64): Provided presence.

Dominican Republic (6 and 7/64): Air and surface patrols.

Tonkin Gulf (8/64): Combat operations.

Dominican Republic (4/65): Intervention and combat operations.

Arab-Israeli War (6/67): Alert, provided presence, covered evacuation of U.S. citizens.

Pueblo Capture (1–4/68): Redeployment of forces; maintained presence in area to take actions as directed.

EC–121 Loss (4/69): Redeployed forces; maintained presence to take actions as directed.

Mr. MONDALE. The Navy, however, refuses to fully recognize the vulnerability of the carrier.

The Navy justification for 15 carriers is based on the theory that the carrier fleet must be adequate to fight, simultaneously, two and one-half wars—that is, a major conventional war upon both the Atlantic and the Pacific, plus a brush-fire war somewhere else.

The Navy assumes that the carrier will be a vital participant in the full range of conventional conflicts—the relatively minor, Dominican Republic type, the mild-range Vietnam type, and the full-scale conventional war—whatever that would be in this nuclear era.

By allocating to itself such a major role in such a range of possible conflicts, the

Navy refuses to acknowledge that events have changed the proper role of the carrier since 1945 by limiting the scenarios in which carriers can be effective.

When engaged in a major conventional war with a sophisticated enemy, the carrier task force will be exposed to a complete range of anticarrier weapons. While the Soviet Union represents the greatest military threat to the carrier, other countries possess various weapons designed for anticarrier warfare.

For example, Desmond Wilson points out that Cuba, China, Indonesia, and Egypt, in addition to the Warsaw Pact states, are known to have large numbers of Soviet-built IL–28 Beagles—bombers which are capable of striking carrier task forces with a 4,400-pound bomb load at a combat radius of about 800 nautical miles. Moreover, the Soviet Union has distributed at least some of their 1,500 to 2,000 TU–16 Badgers, a bomber capable of being used against surface vessels. The Badger, known to have been supplied to China and Indonesia, can carry two air-to-surface missiles or a 7,000-pound load to a radius in excess of 1,500 nautical miles. Large numbers of Mig–21's have been made available to Communist satellites and some neutral states. Furthermore, the Styx missile and other antiship missiles are also in the arsenal of many of the Soviet allies.

In addition to high performance aircraft and missiles, the Soviet Union has distributed a number of its *Whiskey* class long-range conventional submarines to several satellite and neutral nations.

There are, therefore, relatively few scenarios in which you can imagine a carrier free from threats of enemy action and thus able to function effectively in an offensive tactical capacity. This is not to say that the carrier has no role in a conflict where the enemy has some anticarrier capability. But as the capability increases, so does the threat, and carriers simply do not operate effectively in such an environment.

The Navy is quick to remind us that land bases for tactical aircraft are also vulnerable to enemy attack. This is, of course, true. Land bases are subject to attack by aircraft and missiles; in addition, they are uniquely subject to ground attack and artillery, particularly in a guerrilla war as in Vietnam.

But in examining the relative vulnerability of land and sea-based tactical airpower, we must look at their relative effectiveness. The historical record strongly suggests that land bases are less inhibited than carriers by the threat of attack and that they are capable of delivering more offensive sorties.

The threat of enemy attack also makes the carrier less desirable from a cost point of view. It has been estimated that at least one-half of the cost of a carrier task force is allocated for carrier defense. This high allocation of resources to defense sharply raises the cost of each carrier-based offensive sortie. In return for this large investment in carrier defense, we have carrier task forces which, in all probability, would be of little value against high level threats—and are overly oriented toward defense against low level threats.

FAILURE OF OTHER NATIONS TO BUILD CARRIERS

It may well be that all of these considerations explain the reluctance of the Soviet Union—and almost every other nation—to rely on attack carriers. In fact, the United States is the only major military power with an attack carrier in its fleet. Neither the Soviet Union nor China has built a single attack carrier, and neither plans to do so. England is in the process of phasing out its attack carriers, and France is the only other country with such a carrier.

According to a 1969 report by the Seapower Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, the Soviet Union in recent years has built over 500 surface ships in 20 classes. The report states:

> The Soviet Union is developing a massive well-balanced program in virtually all phases of seapower.

The U.S. Navy not only agrees with this assessment, it constantly stresses the growing menace of the Soviet's surface fleet. Only the absence of attack carriers prevents the Soviet fleet from surpassing ours, according to the Navy. The Chief of Naval Operations recently stated that these carriers "are the key to our present superiority," and that "with too few, or none" in the U.S. fleet, "the Soviets would probably be the leading naval power."

Even assuming that carriers are the key to our naval superiority, it is obvious that we do not need as many as 15 carriers to maintain this superiority.

But if the carrier is really such a vital ship, then why have the Soviets failed to build a single attack carrier? Why do they have no plans to do so? Since they are currently in the midst of a massive shipbuilding program and since they obviously have the technological capability to build carriers, their decision to rely on other surface ships cannot be due to limited resources. The U.S. Chief of Naval Operations offered the following explanation for the Soviet failure to build attack carriers:

> Geography, more than any other reason has kept the Soviets out of the aircraft carrier business. The routes of egress from Soviet naval bases to the open oceans are, by way of choke points, controlled by other powers. For an aircraft carrier such a situation could spell disaster in a shooting war. If the Soviets were to gain control of the points, however, the situation might change.

But this constriction of egress from Soviet naval bases to the open seas has not deterred the Soviets from building a large number of almost every other type of surface warship. If the Soviets can move their carriers and destroyers through those choke points, then why would a carrier pose a different problem? It would seem that Soviet naval planners have decided that attack carriers simply are not worth their enormous cost.

Regardless of the reasons for the Soviet decision not to build carriers, our Navy cannot have it both ways. Either carriers are not that vital to a surface fleet and the Soviet Navy is a threat without them, or else the Soviet's surface fleet is not a significant naval threat.

FAILURE OF NAVY TO RECOGNIZE COMPLEMENTARY ROLE

All of these arguments are not intended to prove that there is no need for attack carriers. Indeed, carriers can serve as a complement to land-based air power—but primarily in limited conflicts where land bases are not immediately available.

Despite the Navy's recognition that carriers should be complementary to land-based airpower, it has been unwilling to accept the fact that the need for carriers is reduced where there is ample land-based air capability.

Carriers, for example, were useful in the beginning of the Vietnam conflict when land bases were still limited. But a serious question can be raised whether the Navy's continuing level of involvement in the Vietnam conflict—once sufficient land bases were constructed there—reflects as much the need to give the Navy a "piece of the action" as a reasoned military judgment.

Mr. President, I point out here that the decision to stop bombing in Vietnam, with which I heartily agree, has certainly reduced the need for attack air carrier force levels. One would like to see what response the Navy makes to that change of circumstances.

The designation of six carrier task forces to the Atlantic and nine to the Pacific also attests to the Navy's unwillingness to recognize the complementary nature of carrier-based airpower. Commenting on the Mediterranean task forces, Desmond Wilson wrote:

> With the subsequent development of land-based air covering NATO's southern flank, and with the later introduction into the region and coverage of the region by sea and land-based missile systems, the Sixth Fleet may have become increasingly redundant. It almost certainly became increasingly vulnerable with the marked growth of the Soviet nuclear capability, along with submarine, aviation, and missile delivery systems.

But even this type of fleet deployment can be carried out with less than 15 carriers. The Navy claims that 15 carrier task forces are required to keep five continually on station—two in the Mediterranean and three in the Western Pacific. While the Navy points out that the rate of "on station" deployment has actually been higher in the past, they continue to insist that three task forces are needed to maintain one "on station" throughout the year. This method of deployment is explained as arising from the need to rest the crew, make necessary repairs, and take care of other logistical problems.

The Navy does concede that, but for the need to relieve the crew, a carrier task force could remain on station for a longer period of time. However, they have never satisfactorily explained why the relief of the crew should force the carrier to be withdrawn from forward deployment.

The Navy itself has successfully dealt with this problem in the operation of Polaris submarines by using what is called a "blue and gold" crew concept—

the submarine stays on active duty and the crew is simply rotated. By this method, a Polaris submarine is able to stay on active duty for a significantly longer time than the carrier. And yet, the Navy has failed to adapt this method or a similar one to the attack carrier. Such a procedure would make it possible to deploy five task forces on station with a reduced carrier fleet.

MORE EFFICIENT USE OF PRESENT FLEET

Those who favor the authorization for the new carrier in the pending bill argue that the carrier is needed, even if the carrier force size is reduced. In a recent news conference, Secretary Laird stated:

Whether we have a 12- or 15-carrier force does not affect the request for CVAN-69.

The assumptions underlying this argument are that the older attack carriers are no longer usable; that they, therefore, must be replaced with modern nuclear carriers; and that a congressional decision to defer the building of CVAN-69 will insure that there is a substantial percentage of obsolete attack carriers in the 1970's; and that such a decision will weaken the capacity of our attack carrier fleet, thereby weakening our overall defense posture.

This argument does not square with the facts. To begin with, the attack carriers which have joined the fleet since the mid-1950's are almost double the size of the older carriers, are equipped with the most modern aircraft, and, therefore, have far greater capability for tactical air than the oldest carriers which they replace. The Navy has stated that the nuclear carrier air wing is tactically more than twice as effective as that of the World War II carriers.

But since the Navy has followed a one-for-one replacement policy in the past, the actual capacity of the carrier fleet in terms of providing tactical air power is far greater than the 15 carrier force level would imply. The Navy's carrier replacement policy would, therefore, more accurately be described as a two-for-one policy—an escalation, in fact, of the carrier force level. Even if the Navy can support a case for replacing the older carriers with nuclear carriers, there is no reason why at least two of the older carriers could not be replaced as each new carrier joins the fleet.

We tried for some time, as I indicated earlier, to determine whether the Navy had a shorthand way of indicating the relative effectiveness and capacity of the various carriers.

I am pleased to find that they have worked it out in terms of what they call the A-4 equivalent, which indicates the number and the amount and the type of aircraft that operate on each carrier.

As I said earlier, the older *Hancock* class has an equivalent of 83. The *Nimitz* class has an A-4 equivalent of 152.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation setting forth that information.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nominal air wing complements

Enterprise/Kitty Hawk/Forrestal classes:	
Fighter squadrons (F-4)	2
Light attack squadrons (A-7)	2
Attack squadron (A-6)	1
Electronics warfare/tanker squadron (EKA-3)	1
Airborne early warning squadron (E-2)	1
Reconnaissance squadron (RA-5C)	1
Rescue squadron detachment (UH-2)	1
Total A-4 equivalents	132
Midway class:	
Fighter squadrons (F-8) (F-4's assigned when available)	2
Light attack squadrons (A-7)	2
Attack squadron (A-6)	1
Electronics warfare/tanker squadron (EKA-3)	1
Airborne, early warning squadron (E-2)	1
Reconnaissance squadron (RF-8G)	1
Rescue squadron detachment (UH-2)	1
Total A-4 equivalents	108
Hancock class:	
Fighter squadrons (F-8)	2
Light attack squadrons (A-4)	3
Electronics warfare/tanker squadron (EKA-3)	1
Airborne early warning squadron detachment (E-1B)	1
Reconnaissance squadron detachment (RF-8G)	1
Rescue squadron detachment (UH-2)	1
Total A-4 equivalents	83
Nimitz class (the air wing listed below is planned for the *Nimitz* in fiscal year 1973):	
Fighter squadrons (F-14)	2
Light attack squadrons (A-7)	2
Attack squadron (A-6)	1
Tanker squadron (KA-6)	1
Electronics warfare squadron (EA-6)	1
Airborne early warning squadron (E-2)	1
Reconnaissance squadron (RA-5C)	1
Rescue squadron detachment (UH-2)	1
Total A-4 equivalents	152

(NOTE.—The types of aircraft which can be operated by a carrier depend primarily upon the flight deck and its installations such as the catapults, arresting gear and elevators. Ship-installed support facilities also limit aircraft types which can be operated. The number of aircraft which can be carried depends upon deck area and the mix of types. Some types of aircraft are considerably larger than others, and a smaller total of generally larger aircraft can be physically accommodated. The smallest tactical aircraft in the U.S. Navy's carrier inventory is the A-4 *Skyhawk*. Therefore, for standardization purposes, the Navy expresses carrier aircraft capacity in terms of A-4 equivalents.

Mr. MONDALE. This increased capability of the carrier fleet means that today's 15 attack carriers can deliver more tactical air support than the 15 carriers which comprised the fleet in the mid-1950's. That is why Secretary McNamara relied on the increased capability of the newer carriers as a justification for reducing the size of the carrier fleet. Unless it is assumed that the need for tactical airpower has substantially increased in the past 15 years, a decision to defer the building of an additional nuclear carrier will not endanger national security.

Nor does a decision to postpone this carrier mean that we will be stuck with an obsolete attack carrier fleet. I referred to this argument several times today. Excluding the oldest four carriers, the attack carrier force consists of one nuclear carrier, the *Enterprise*; eight *Forrestal* carriers, and three *Midways;* in 1972, the second nuclear carrier, CVAN-68, will join the fleet. At least 12 of these 13 carriers are suited for handling all modern aircraft with safety and efficiency.

I emphasize that because the Armed Services Committee report cites as one of its main reasons the fact that many of the new aircraft cannot be accommodated on these carriers.

The truth is that 12, or perhaps 13, of these carriers can handle everything we are making and plan to make. In addition, the three *Midways* are the only carriers in this group over 13 years old, and two of these carriers have recently been modernized.

This means that we will have 13 attack carriers which are not obsolete by the Navy's standards, at least through 1976, and probably longer in light of the modernization of the *Midways*. Even if we decide not to authorize funds for CVAN-69, the attack carrier force level will remain at 13 fully effective ships—by the Navy's definition—for some time.

But why are the World War II attack carriers called obsolete?

Secretary McNamara testified before Congress in 1964 that the chronological age of a particular ship was not important in determining fleet obsolescence. Rather, the key question was whether a ship "is able to perform its mission in the face of the expected threat."

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to look at the list of occasions on which the carrier has been used as set forth by Admiral Moorer, and I ask how many of these minor events are events in which, if a carrier has to be used at all, one of the older carriers would not be adequate and how many events as listed by the admiral require the latest, largest, and most advanced carriers?

The Armed Services Committee, as well as the Navy, maintains that these older carriers are "simply inadequate to serve efficiently and safely the newest aircraft now operating in the fleet." However, these carriers can certainly handle other jet aircraft—such as F-8's—with safety and efficiency. And since the usefulness of attack carriers is limited to conflicts where there are low-level threats, there is no reason why these older carriers cannot continue to provide tactical air support—that is, if the Navy insists that it needs a minimum of 15 attack carriers.

It should be pointed out that the Navy's carrier fleet is not limited to attack carriers. There are, in addition, six smaller carriers, used primarily for anti-submarine warfare. These carriers are capable of handling several types of tactical jet fighters, and one of them is being currently used in Vietnam in an "attack" capacity. Surely such carriers could be used to supplement the existing attack fleet in many cases where limited tactical air power is called for. It be-

comes all the more difficult, therefore, to justify the beginning of a brandnew attack carrier in light of the overwhelming cost of a fleet which actually numbers not 15 but 21.

The Navy claims that a "modern force" of 15 attack carriers, in which each ship is retired after 30 years of service, requires a construction program including a new carrier every other year. But there are several alternatives for maintaining or increasing the number of carriers capable of providing tactical air support, without resorting to such a costly construction program. Given the more limited role of carriers called for by modern military realities, the requirement for a fleet composed entirely of huge attack carriers, all capable of handling the most modern aircraft, is at best questionable.

It is likely that the Navy will not accept a more limited carrier role. The Navy insists that the attack carrier can meet any conventional war contingency, claiming the carrier to be no more vulnerable today than it was in World War II. Such a position ignores a warning made some years ago by the great naval historian, Alfred Mahan:

> He (the strategist) will observe also that changes of tactics have not only taken place after changes in weapons, which necessarily is the case, but that the interval between such changes has been unduly long. This doubtless arises from the fact that an improvement of weapons is due to the energy of one or two men, while changes in tactics have to overcome the inertia of a conservative class; but it is a great evil. It can be remedied only by a candid recognition of each change; by careful study of the powers and limitations of the new ship or weapon, and by a consequent adaptation of the method of using it to the qualities it possesses, which will constitute its tactics. History shows that it is vain to hope that military men generally will be at pains to do this, but that the ones who do will go into battle with a great advantage—a lesson in itself of no mean value.

FOREIGN POLICY IMPLICATIONS

There is another basic motivation for our amendment, other than the call for an evaluation of the proper carrier force level. For, in addition to these problems of efficiency and effectiveness, the use of the aircraft carrier has serious foreign policy implications. For example, it is official naval doctrine that one of the main advantages of carrier airpower is that it can be employed unilaterally, without involving third parties and without relying upon treaties, agreements, or overflight rights.

One such instance is the use of the carrier task force to show the flag or to establish our military presence in an unstable region. There may have been times in the past when a show of force has lent stability or discouraged hostilities. On the other hand, there is reason to believe that the ready availability of American power has, at times, generated unilateral action where such intervention has actually been harmful to our image and our interests.

The Senate has an obligation to debate whether it is in our national interest to maintain 15 carrier task forces "posed for unilateral action." In fulfilling this obligation, we need to know the situations in which carriers have been used in this "show of force" role and the reasons for such a use of the carrier. Even if it is determined that this is a legitimate use of naval power, the question arises whether attack carriers are essential in performing this mission—would smaller carriers or other warships have the same effect?

The Navy also contends that a carrier can always be counted upon for tactical air support in a limited engagement where land bases may not be available because of political constraints. To be sure, there may be times, as in the early days of the Korean war, when land bases are actually held by enemy forces, and carrier-based air support may be a valuable temporary complement to nearly all land bases.

But how much of our overall defense capability should be devoted to that unlikely possibility where we might be called upon to defend a nation and, at the same time, be denied the use of its bases for tactical support? And, if the commitment arises out of a multination treaty, such as SEATO, should there not be land bases available to us in at least some of those nations in the treaty organization? If we need carrier-based airpower to allow us to meet foreign commitments in areas where the United States is denied the use of land bases, it may well be that there is something amiss about the nature of these commitments.

In recent congressional testimony, the Chief of Naval Operations stated:

> The carrier will be necessary in the future if the U.S. is to have the flexibility and the selectivity of operations in areas *without first having to make some political arrangement to do so.* [Emphasis added.]

In light of such testimony, it is important for Congress to be involved in determining those situations in which the United States should be prepared to intervene in conflicts unilaterally and "without first having to make some political arrangements to do so."

A congressional inquiry into the foreign policy implications in the use of carriers is necessary to assure that foreign policy determines the need for military expenditures—rather than the other way around.

CONCLUSION

Because of these foreign policy implications and, more important, because of the overwhelming evidence that the carrier is an extravagant and often unnecessary means of providing tactical air support, the request for an additional carrier raises fundamental questions which must be answered.

Throughout this statement, certain contentions have been made about the role of the attack carrier, the manner in which it is deployed, and the proper size of the carrier fleet. It should be emphasized, however, that the burden for justifying the carrier in this bill—as well as other carriers—is and should be on the Navy. And while there may be strong disagreement with some of the points raised herein, there should be little doubt that the Navy has simply failed to meet its obligation in this matter. The one point the Navy has made in response to the question of whether we need 15 carriers is that the matter is under study.

The Navy has responded to questioning of the carrier force level with vague and general assertions that at least 15 attack carriers are needed to meet the various contingencies which might arise in fulfilling U.S. commitments and in protecting national security. There has been little or no explanation as to why changing missions and contingencies have not altered the carrier force level.

Again I bring up the fact that none of our carriers in Vietnam was used primarily in the bombing of North Vietnam. I am glad we stopped bombing there. Is this not, then, a proper time to consider whether we could reduce some of the attack carrier force levels, now that that mission is no longer necessary?

In response to doubts about the efficacy of sea-based air power, the Navy points out that since the seas cover three-fourths of the earth's surface, the carrier can be used in many more places than land bases. The military historian will recognize the disturbing similarity between this argument and that advanced in 1922 by a major in the Cavalry who, observing the absence of roads on much of the earth's surface, wrote:

> To base our transportation needs solely upon conditions existent in the comparatively tiny portion of the earth's surface containing roads . . . is putting too many eggs in the same basket.

As we have seen, there are substantial doubts within the Defense Department as to whether a fleet of 15 attack carriers can be justified. Indeed, the Defense Department's official response to a congressional inquiry about the need for this many carriers is that the entire matter is under study. We know that classified recommendations from the Systems Analysis Office have recommended the same thing. It has made observations about the relative costs of sea-based air that should be the subject of and should be available for the Senate's consideration, but because of classification by the Defense Department, it cannot be produced here. Until this study is completed, Congress is asked to continue spending for carriers as if the need for a fleet of 15 was clear.

In effect, the Defense Department would have us reverse the normal authorization process. Instead of seeking funds for items which have already been justified, we are being asked to provide funds in expectation of a rationale. We are not following a policy of one for one. Our policy is not neutral, even with respect to force levels, because each new nuclear task force attack carrier is nearly twice as effective as the one it is replacing.

It would be fiscally irresponsible for Congress to act in this manner. At a time when the American people are bearing an overwhelming tax burden, at a time when the President is calling for a 75-percent cutback in Federal construction, and when inflation is demanding economies in every area of Government spending, we must demand adequate justification for all programs.

That is why we have introduced our amendment. The amendment in no way

questions the integrity of military leaders or of the civilian officials at the Defense Department. If anything, the amendment is a bipartisan recognition of the fact that those of us in Congress have failed to ask the hard questions concerning military spending that we have asked in the domestic area. Our past history of blanket acceptance of the military budget not only is in sharp contrast to our close scrutiny of proposed domestic programs; it also amounts to an abdication of our responsibility under the Constitution "to provide for the common defense," "to raise and support armies," and "to provide and maintain a navy."

The acquiescence in military matters is particularly true of that part of the military budget involving the general purpose forces—as opposed to strategic nuclear forces. These forces, which include everything from carriers to manpower, make up 60 percent of the peacetime defense budget. And yet, their underlying assumptions and objectives are seldom discussed by Congress and the public.

In calling for congressional vigilance over military spending, I am acutely aware of the high priority of national defense. In my earlier colloquy with the Senator from Missouri, I pointed out that in the 5 years I have been in the Senate, I have voted for $289 billion in defense spending. But approval of questionable items in the defense budget does not serve the cause of national defense. It has been observed that national security can best be maintained if we are "efficient in the forces we buy"—any time forces cost more than is necessary to do a job, our inefficiency may require us to give up other policy commitments.

There is another reason why it is imperative to take a close look at military expenditures. Because of the pressing nature of our other national priorities, any form of unnecessary and unjustified Federal spending must detract from our commitments to our children, our cities, our towns, our farms, and our natural environment.

Budget Director Charles Schultze observed:

> The benefits and costs of proposed military programs cannot be viewed in isolation. They must be related to and measured against those other national priorities which, in the context of limited resources, their adoption must necessarily sacrifice.

The time when we could afford the luxury of such "eternal verities" as a fleet of 15 carriers has long since passed. I am very much afraid that unless we take a close look at this carrier program, our children will observe in the future that our blind adherence to 15 attack carriers was every bit as absurd and wasteful as the failure to recognize the demise of the battleship and the obsolescense of the horse cavalry.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota on a remarkable speech. It is remarkable because there is no question that this enormous amount of spending does require a challenge. We have not had this kind of documented and thorough challenge in the years I have been in the Senate. There have been times when we objected to aircraft carriers in the past, but it was suggested that there had been a comprehensive study of the kind that this speech represents.

As I understand what the Senator said, as long ago as 1965, the Secretary of Defense, in his posture statement, called for some reduction in attack carriers by the early 1970's.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct. The former Secretary of Defense cited a number of reasons in support of a reduced role for one attack carrier. He cited the effective end of the carrier's role in strategic retaliation, given our land and submarine-based missiles.

He referred to a number of developments in modern carriers, modern aircraft, and modern refueling techniques. These developments give our existing carriers a far greater capability. They also give our existing land bases a far greater range and effectiveness. For example, in the last few years the reach of land-based air has increased from two to two and a half times and with refueling techniques it is even more than that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the posture statement of the then Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT BY SECRETARY MCNAMARA

By the early 1970's we plan to make some reduction in the number of attack carriers. Therefore, in the fiscal years 1965–69 program the new investment in aircraft and ships is limited to that which would be required by a somewhat smaller CVA force.

This judgment is supported by four major considerations:

(1) The *Forrestal* class carriers are much more effective than the *Essex* class they are replacing. A *Forrestal* class costs between one-third to one-half again as much as an *Essex*, but this differential does seem justified. For example, the area available for spotting aircraft is about 50 percent greater; overhead clearances in the hangar bays are about 40 percent greater, permitting larger aircraft to be stowed; aviation fuel and ordnance storage spaces are greater, allowing longer periods of sustained combat; and so forth.

(2) The capabilities of carrier-based aircraft are improving steadily. In the attack aircraft field, we are replacing the early A–4's with the A–4E's, and an entirely new all-weather, large payload aircraft, the A–6, is being introduced. In the fighter field, we are replacing the F–8 low supersonic, fair-weather day fighter armed with Sidewinder missiles, with the supersonic all-weather F–4, armed with Sparrow air-to-air missiles. Further gains in combat capability will be realized when still more effective aircraft, such as the new VAL (which I will discuss presently), and the F–111 (TFX), become available later in the planning period.

(3) By fiscal year 1966, when we will have a large number of strategic missiles in place, the CVA forces will be relieved of their strategic alert retaliatory mission, thus releasing additional capabilities for the carriers' limited war misison. Assignment of carriers to strategic missions restricts their flexibility in terms of areas in which they can operate and the kinds of operations they can conduct. If pilots and aircraft must be held on nuclear alert, limited war capabilities are reduced.

(4) The increasing range of land-based tactical aircraft has reduced our requirement for forward based airpower. The F–4's with inflight refueling, can be flown to Europe and the West Pacific. The TFX will be able to deploy to Europe without any inflight refueling.

Although a precise analysis of the optimum number of carriers is difficult to make, it seems clear on the basis of these factors that some reduction in the number of attack carriers will be possible by the end of this decade.

We have deleted from the shipbuilding program the previously planned fiscal year 1965 carrier but have tentatively programed another new carrier in a later year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Minnesota also points out that the notion that we should have 15 attack carriers goes back to a time when we faced Japan in the Pacific.

Mr. MONDALE. It actually goes back further.

Mr. PROXMIRE. To 1921.

Mr. MONDALE. Dr. Wilson wrote a thesis on the attack carrier and he tried unsuccessfully to determine what policies and decisions justified what he called the "eternal verities" of a fleet of 15 battleships, followed after World War II by 15 attack carriers. The only thing he could find was the agreement in 1921, the Washington Naval Disarmament Treaty, that we should have 15 ships. The Navy came back and said we said they had not had 15 ships.

We called an expert on the matter and we have had printed in the RECORD today a table. As a matter of fact the number of carriers we have had every year since 1946 has been 15.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This research has not been done publicly before. It has not been publicly disclosed. I think it is very significant.

In World War II we were facing Japan, which was a great sea power in the Pacific where positions were so farflung. Japan had its own attack carrier fleet and a great air force. A large number of attack carriers was then logical and necessary. Now, Japan has disarmed.

What kind of navy does China have? Roughly how big is China's navy?

Mr. MONDALE. It is insignificant, I am sure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am talking about in comparison with the navy we faced in Japan.

Mr. MONDALE. I would not think there is any comparison. I am not an expert.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not wish to intrude on the time of anyone, but as a matter of taking inventory of our time, I wish to make an observation. We are not going to be in session tomorrow. The Senator from Minnesota will remember that I suggested he obtain the floor first today, and I objected to anyone else obtaining the floor until he arrived this morning.

However, in fair play, several other

Senators wish to speak. The Senator from Washington has been waiting. The Senator from Virginia has been waiting all day. I think the chairman of the committee should say at least a few words without attempting to cut off anyone else. In that sense of recognition, if the Senator could conclude shortly, I would take just a few minutes. The Senator from New York has a speech he feels compelled to make this afternoon.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator. The Senator has been very kind to me. We had the recess for the funeral. I have yielded a good deal, and thus it has taken me nearly 5 hours.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator does not have to yield indefinitely. I do not want to make a point of order, but the Senator cannot yield to anyone to make a speech.

Mr. MONDALE. I shall yield the floor in just a moment. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I fully support the position of the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. This matter is one which should be discussed extensively.

I hope we do not have the vote on Monday; and before we vote, I hope we can develop the issue thoroughly.

I have listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the Senator from Minnesota.

It was necessary for me to be in my State part of yesterday. I hope not to miss the vote on this issue. Let us continue until all the facts are on the table.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall continue briefly. I appreciate the need for others who want to speak and speak soon.

I am delighted that the Senator in his presentation stressed at the outset that he is not making a proposal that we eliminate all of our carriers. He is saying we should consider whether we need 13 or 14.

On the 14, this is the issue that should be debated again and again, I am sure, in the course of debate, as in the course of the so-called briefings—the brainwashing to which we have been subjected by those who oppose the amendment—that we cannot eliminate all the carriers, because if we do, we will be defenseless. No one is suggesting that. The Senator from Minnesota would provide merely for a study as to whether it is necessary to spend this additional money for this additional carrier.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator could also observe that this is not a bizarre request. In fact, as we gather here this moment, we know that the Defense Department and the National Security Council have requested and may have already received a study on the very issue we are talking about today. It is obvious that this is a case where the legislative and executive branches can work together with mutual studies and come up with a rational decision that can bring about the most effective and sensible defense and would generate the kind of public confidence which that would bring about.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was present at the joint economic hearing when former Director of the Budget Schultze testified. In my view, he is the most able man who ever served in the Budget Bureau. He of course was responsible for expenditures covering a vast area, including military expenditures, for a number of years. This kind of question is rarely asked. Either the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) or Representative MOORHEAD asked Mr. Schultze if he could designate the area of military spending which, in his view, should have the lowest priority where we could justify most clearly a reduction. Without any equivocation or qualification at all. Budget Director Schultze said, "Yes, a 15th aircraft carrier." In his view, it was the hardest to justify of all that was in the $80 billion budget.

I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota brought that out, because I think it is the kind of thing that should make us stop, look, and listen.

May I also commend the Senator from Minnesota on his stress on the revolution we have had in military weaponry. It is a revolution. Some people say we have had a revolution almost every 5 years. There has been a dramatic change. Yet we go on and on on the basis of a set justification that we had 20 years ago and we must have exactly the same now. We make the same kind of argument that we have to have the same fleet we had in the past. I would also like finally to commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri on what I think is a most impressive analysis of the cost of maintaining a carrier fleet. He points out, first, not only that we have the ships, but the planes, and the escort carriers and another fleet behind it, and a third fleet. So, we end up with something that we were told in World War II cost $83 million, was $171 million at the time of the Korean war, and is now $510 million to $700 million for this one——

Mr. MONDALE. It might be $700 million, but somewhere between $510 million and $700 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It could be. I have heard the figure in committee unchallenged, as given by the Senator from Missouri, of $1.8 billion for the whole fleet.

Mr. MONDALE. The Navy says it will cost $1.8 billion for an attack carrier, the wing, the destroyers, and the escorts. Of course, that has to be times three.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, times three. Then we get $5.4 billion to maintain a carrier fleet with replacements. The 15 carriers, that is right. This refers to 40 percent of the entire operating budget of the U.S. Navy. This cost is so astronomical, I suppose the only way we can appreciate it is in proportion to other spending. That $5.4 billion is 15 times as much as we spend on low- and middle-income housing for the entire country. It is more than twice as much as is spent on Federal aid to elementary and secondary education in the entire Nation. So that I think to put this in perspective and to challenge it is not to say that we tear down the military force or weaken it or enfeeble it, but as the Senator says so well, it will save money to be used more wisely in our defense, or in some other areas which are so essential.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator. I want to yield, because the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) has been very kind to let me complete my message.

I would simply say this in closing, that the one set of nuclear carriers, destroyers, and so forth, to keep one wing on station, would cost nearly $1 billion more than the President's widely heralded new welfare program which is supposed to bring sustenance, health, and the good life to 22 million Americans.

One other point in closing, and that is that Systems Analysis has completed this year in July a study of cost effectiveness, a cost comparison between the same wing of aircraft, one on sea and one on land. It is classified. I cannot give the figures. But the cost comparison shows astonishing savings that can be made through land-based aircraft.

I want to thank the Senator from Mississippi for his impressive patience here today. I regret it has taken so long, but I have yielded to so many Senators both pro and con that it has taken this much time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the attack carrier is the backbone of the surface Navy of the United States. The carrier force is the primary naval strength which assures us freedom of the seas in the face of a growing Russian maritime capability. And freedom of the seas is absolutely essential to the security of these United States. The Soviet Union, which is situated on the large land mass of Europe and Asia, has access to most of the world's raw materials over land lines of communication. On the other hand, the United States must use the sea lanes to provide critical raw materials not available in this hemisphere, as well as the tremendous amounts of fuel that are needed to operate an industrial machine in peace or a war machine during hostilities. Our reliance on the high seas for the movement of the bulk of our overseas cargo is a simple matter of geography: We are essentially an island and this is not a transient condition but a permanent, unchanging physical fact.

To maintain our capability to preserve the freedom of the seas for the pursuit of our own national interest under the threat of a growing Russian Navy, we must have a strong modern Navy. This can only be achieved through the continuing input of new and modern ships. Let me just make this point, Mr. President—we are not building a new fleet; we are trying to maintain a viable force by replacing aging ships which can no longer perform their mission in the face of the rapidly increasing strength of the threat that they face. The attack carrier is the basic building block of our Navy's strength. It seems to me that delaying the acquisition of this carrier, while costs continue to rise, and funds are spent on obsolete equipment, constitutes false economy.

As a maritime power with our very survival as a first-class Nation depending on freedom of the seas, it is a matter of

great concern to me, Mr. President, that our capability of insuring the uninterrupted use of the sealanes of communication is being actively threatened. I was impressed by some rather startling statistics which were cited by Admiral Moorer, the Chief of Naval Operations, in an address last month to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He pointed out that the Soviet Union has more than quadrupled its merchant ship tonnage since 1950. On the other hand, today the United States has less than a third of the merchant shipping which we operated in 1950.

Admiral Moorer pointed out that the same trend prevails in combatant ships. Mere numbers tell only part of the story though: Nearly 60 percent of our warships upon which our forward defense strategy depends, are 20 years old or more, while in the Soviet Navy, of the 1,000 or more surface combatants and submarines currently in the Soviet Fleet, less than one-fourth of 1 percent are past the 20-year mark.

In the face of this dramatic increase in naval capability by the Soviet Union, I consider it the height of imprudence for us to allow our own fleet to rust away into obsolescence while we drag our feet and fail to provide the replacement ships that will keep our Navy a viable force.

On the subject of modernization, Mr. President, I think it is important for Senators to recognize that the need for the carrier which is funded in this bill does not depend for its validity on a carrier force level of 15 or 16 carriers. When this ship goes into the fleet in 1974 it will replace a carrier which at that time will be 30 years old—it replaces an *Essex*-type carrier of World War II vintage which is not capable of handling such modern aircraft as the F–4, the RA–5C, the A–6, or the F–14. Thus, Mr. President, the *Essex* class carrier today is restricted to second class fighters and by 1974, when it is replaced, it will be operating what is, in effect, third-rate planes. I think it is clear, Mr. President, that we are approaching the time when the *Essex* class air wing cannot survive in the threat environment established by the newest Soviet tactical aircraft. Certainly we will reach that point before CVAN–69 can be completed, even if it is started this year. I for one am not willing to say to our pilots and crewmen, "Do the best you can with these inferior weapons. They are all your country can afford." I can see no valid reason for delaying the funding of this carrier any further while we restudy the requirement. The requirement has been validated by careful study and analysis in the Navy, the Department of Defense, and the Congress when we studied this three-ship building program in 1968. The sea lanes are too vital to us as a maritime power to risk their loss. We need this carrier and we need to start it this year.

The reasons for this action are as follows:

First. For all levels of military action other than all-out nuclear war—from a show of force to general war—the attack carrier is the primary striking force of our Navy. It provides the offensive power necessary to assure free use of the seas and the air over the seas in support of our national objectives.

Second. Despite the tremendous technological progress that has been made in transportation and weapons systems in this century, free use of the seas—which cover three-fourths of the earth's surface—continues to be essential to the security of the United States, whether we are forced to fight to defend ourselves or to help defend our allies.

Third. Today our overseas allies depend upon our support, which must come by sea. There is no valid plan for overseas military operations of the Army, Air Force, or amphibious forces with embarked marines that does not depend on our free use of the seas. For example, 98 percent of all of the supplies which have gone to Vietnam have been carried by ships.

Fourth. Our present national strategy relies heavily upon military forces deployed overseas—forces capable of responding to a spectrum of contingencies in overseas areas of primary national interest. These forward deployed forces, which must be supplied by sea, provide this country with flexible and rapid response to whatever pressures our potential enemies may apply.

Fifth. A change in national strategy resulting in the withdrawal of our deployed military forces, would increase the requirement to maintain a strong maritime posture. The capability of the United States to fight for an extended period in defense of its territory and areas of interest is dependent on our ability to maintain the flow of materials and oil over the seas. The sheer bulk of the daily use of oil for military and industrial needs precludes stockpiling quantities for more than short-term needs.

Sixth. An effective tactical air capability is essential to sustain our general purpose and logistic support forces against a determined enemy using modern weapons. Sea-based and land-based tactical aircraft are required to provide support for our forces in the areas of the world where we must be prepared to fight.

Seventh. Land-based tactical aircraft can be employed when their land bases have been adequately prepared, provisioned and defended, and when they are located within range of the area of conflict.

Eighth. Sea-based tactical aircraft are required when land bases are not available or do not have the capacity to meet the required tactical aircraft needs. The attack carriers can quickly concentrate this sea-based tactical air power.

There are those that say that carriers are provocative; that they tend to involve the United States in the affairs of other nations and commit us to wars we do not want to fight. To this I can only say that of all our major instruments of national power, the carrier is the least provocative. U.S. bases on foreign soil invariably involve political and military commitments in exchange for base rights. The bases themselves, as centers of U.S. power and influence, invite attack from dissident elements in the host country, involving us in unwanted confrontations, committing us to measures not in consonance with our overall national policy. Sovereignty questions associated with our overseas bases have caused problems between our Government and host nations and have been a major source of the Yankee-go-home sentiment. Attack carriers, on the other hand, are mobile air bases which can be retained in home waters and deployed or withdrawn to meet changing international situations without altering our international commitments. Carriers can remain in home waters and then deploy to an overseas trouble spot. When deployed, the carrier can remain in the wings, out of sight, so as not to upset a delicate situation but still be available to unleash its power at a moment's notice or should the situation dictate, the deployed carrier can appear on the scene and by its very presence provide a stabilizing influence by serving as tangible evidence of U.S. interests.

A final word, Mr. President, about the effect that delay in funding this carrier this year would have. I am sure the Senators are aware that we have already obligated in 1968 and 1969 funds, some $132.9 million, and that a large portion of this has either been spent or would be lost in termination charges if the contract for long leadtime nuclear propulsion components were terminated. In addition, the Navy estimates that the disruptions in the production plan might well add an additional $100 million to the projected total cost of this carrier should we make the delayed decision next year to fund the carrier with fiscal year 1971 funds. Mr. President, I am proud of the efforts of the Senate this year to reduce the spending level of our national defense. I know that this has been a sincere effort, a dedicated effort, but we must all recognize that the threat we are facing is not diminishing and if we reduce the level of our spending to oppose that threat, then we must get more for our money. We must spend our available defense funds more wisely. In my judgment, Mr. President, it is not wise to waste funds on indecision. It is not wise to delay the introduction of needed capability into our fleet needlessly, and that, in my judgment, is what this amendment would do: First, inject needless delay, and second, substantially increase the cost in the weapon system which I am convinced is urgently required to maintain modern naval forces that are vital to our national interests. I hope that the amendment will not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not undertake today, particularly at this time, to outline all of the real, basic reasons for inclusion in the bill of the carrier. I shall do so in the course of future debate. But many other Senators are prepared to speak on the subject. As chairman of the committee, I wish briefly to sum up what I think are the real issues and the real decision to be made.

In the first place, there is no law that sets 15 or any other number as the level of the carrier force. They are not authorized in that way. The President can order them cut in half tonight. He would not be violating any law if he did so. This matter is passed on every time a

bill on the subject comes before the Senate, or on an appropriation bill. The Appropriations Committee could recommend cutting down on the number of carriers by cutting down on the money. That would be the issue. So there is no single, fixed law about it.

This afternoon, I have already explained that this is purely a replacement. We have four types of planes, four of the major ones of all the planes that fly from carriers, that cannot even use the old carriers. In the course of time, something must be done about them. The only thing to do, anyway, is to have the modern weapons and phase out the older ones as fast as can be done with prudence. How much is taken out because of this one going in will be determined by conditions that exist in 1974.

That will be a judgment matter for the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Congress.

We start with the fact here that 3 years ago Mr. McNamara—he has been quoted on both sides of this matter, but he is a very knowledgeable man—decided that this country should have three modern *Nimitz*-class carriers. The plan was to get them over a period of 6 years, one every 2 years. We have already slipped on that 1 year in time; $140 million, in round numbers, has already been appropriated for the carrier we are talking about, and a great deal of that has been spent under authorizations of the Congress. Virtually all of it has been authorized under the authority of the Congress. Now this is for the final payment on it.

But someone comes along and says, "Wait. We ought to have the General Accounting Office look into this. We ought to cut back and overrule these people until we can get certain information from them."

I understand an amendment has been offered to change the provision from the General Accounting Office to the Congress, but, anyway, that is the motivation, or part of it, involved in the amendment.

There are no overruns involved, because there has not been time for overruns with respect to this particular carrier. However, I have the figures for the overruns for the last two we built of this kind. One had an authorized total cost of $280 million, with an actual cost of $298 million. The second one had an authorized cost of $293 million. The actual cost was $247 million, so that cost was almost $50 million less than the estimate.

So we are talking here in a category of something that is fairly definite and fixed. The matter has already been started. The money has been spent. The only issue here, after all, is the modernization of weapons.

There is another item that has been spoken against already, the A–14, which is to be an ultramodern Navy plane to take the place of the one that did not pan out, the Navy version of the TFX. Those two go together to show the need for modernization. We must be up front with the best weapons that science and money can afford.

In my humble opinion, Mr. President, this carrier fleet is the best possible investment we could make, world conditions being what they are and our leadership being what it is. There has been talk about Soviet Russia having no carriers. Of course Soviet Russia does not have carriers as compared with us. She does not have any commitments, either, in the Pacific to protect Japan. She does not have any commitments to protect the Philippines or the State of Hawaii in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. She does not have any commitments with reference to Formosa. She has no commitments with respect to protecting Korea over all those water miles, even if she has commitments with respect to North Korea. It is a land-based nation, living off the land, where the life of the people is, and the country has few commitments.

This carrier force, after all, which is able to exert a deterrence, and which has a stabilizing influence, has been the single most powerful influence in world affairs since World War II.

I have a list of the incidents which have happened when our carrier force was directly involved. In the Korean war, 10 carriers engaged in combat operations during the period of that unfortunate conflict. We remember that our air bases were knocked out earlier. If it had not been for our carrier fleet, where would we have been or where would the United Nations Forces have been?

I will skip down the list to the Kinmen Island, 1957, Communist shelling, in which the naval units were dispatched to defend Taiwan. Four carriers were on the scene. Taiwan was once the symbol of our efforts to protect those parts of Asia from encroachment.

The Lebanon civil war in 1958. Three carriers provided air cover for the Marine landing.

Does anyone belittle the Mediterranean Sea? When the conflict came, what was it there that did the work and carried the protection?

Quemoy and Matsu crisis in 1958. Many of us remember that. Three carriers were sent to cover evacuation and two additional carriers alerted.

The Cuban civil war in 1956 and 1958. One carrier was on the scene to cover evacuation and provide a presence.

The Quemoy and Matsu presence again in 1962.

The Cuban missile crisis in October and November 1962. Naval forces provided protection and intervention. Eight carriers were on the scene.

The Arab-Israel war, June 1967. Two carriers were on the scene to cover evacuation.

We saw the headlines in the morning newspapers. Shooting is going on over there now.

In my humble opinion, if it were not for the American fleet in the Mediterranean area—and I am not trying to stir up anything—within 6 months' time Greece and Turkey could be invaded and more serious troubles and clashes could, and probably in time would, occur in the Near East.

Those are the practicalities. We are talking about hardware. We are talking about modernization. We are talking about some of the most effective and some of the most immediately available weapons we could possibly use.

It is all right to challenge this matter. Debate is always wholesome. But no one need think this subject has been a quiet subject all these years. This matter has been heard in the Appropriations Committee year after year after year, and we on the Appropriations Committee are all familiar with the conflict of interest between the Air Force and the Navy. I speak with proper respect for both branches, but I do not have any patience with their eternal argument about which is the best and which is the worst, which is the most effective and which is the least effective. It is just "trade talk," mostly, and very few members of the Appropriations Committee who have followed the matter all the way through have any doubt about the need for this weapon to be there at the right time at the right place.

I will help take the lead in reducing the amount of the cost of the operations of the Navy as to carriers or anything else. I will help anyone who goes at it in the right way. But I will not come in here and attack from the side or from the rear in any way on the foremost and the keenest possible naval weapon we could have, except for our modern submarines, which serve in another field.

Let us get down to someone who knows something about the subject, another man who wears his uniform. I will take his word anywhere, any time, any place, in a statement for himself or against himself.

That is Admiral Rickover. I wrote Admiral Rickover a letter; I did not call him up and ask him what he thought, what he would say, or anything else. I just wrote him a letter and told him I wanted to know what he thought about carriers. I knew one thing: He would put submarines first, which he did. He knows the subject, and he knows why, and we can thank God there has been a Rickover, and that Congress would not let them put him out of the Navy 10 years ago. We can be thankful for that.

But that very fine man and very gracious officer said:

> There are, however, some important Navy missions, which cannot, in any known practical way, be carried out by submarines.

Then, after he complimented the submarines, he said:

> One of these is the provision of sea-based tactical air power to protect our sea lanes and our air lanes over the seas, as well as to support amphibious operations and overseas military land operations beyond the range of the land-based tactical air power available to us.

Then he goes on, and I shall read more from this letter, but briefly now I shall read, as he gives them, the reasons for his conclusions about this *Nimitz*-class carrier and the need for it.

He said:

> Three-fourths of the earth's surface is covered by water; 95 percent of the world's population live within range of carrier aircraft.
>
> The United States is essentially an island between two oceans—an island dependent on free use of the seas for transport of material and fuels necessary for our survival—

I mentioned our commitments a while ago. He continues:

> No valid plan exists for overseas military operations by the Army—

This is Rickover speaking—

by the Air force, or by amphibious forces, which does not depend on our ability to guarantee free use of the seas. Virtually all supplies to Vietnam, for example, have been carried by ships.

That will be true a long, long time, in spite of the C–5A's, to Vietnam or some other Vietnam. A lot of it will have to go by ship, the followup part particularly. He continued:

Without a modern attack carrier force, the United States is not assured free use of the seas in those areas of the world that are important to us. It is simply not practicable to establish enough land air bases adequately prepared, provisioned, defended, and within range of potential areas of conflict.

This is still Rickover speaking:

Seven of the sixteen carriers currently operating in the attack carrier role were launched during or shortly after World War II. Five of these cannot operate several of the modern aircraft types now in the fleet. They will not be able to operate air wings which can survive against Soviet weapons technology of the 1970's.

That is the admiral still speaking, Mr. President.

Each *Nimitz*-class carrier—

And that is what we are arguing about—

will carry 50 percent more aircraft ammunition and twice as much aircraft fuel as the latest conventional powered attack carrier. This, combined with the unlimited high speed endurance provided by nuclear power will greatly increase their capability for sustained combat operations.

* * * * *

The *Nimitz*-class will be the best protected and least vulnerable carriers ever designed—

That is the *Nimitz* class, which is what is in this bill—

The added protection is provided by extensive use of armor against bombs and guided missiles, as well as by improved anti-torpedo hull design. The unlimited endurance at high speed and freedom from the need to slow down to refuel provided by nuclear propulsion further reduces the carriers' vulnerability.

Our friends here say all the carriers are vulnerable. Is there any weapon that is not vulnerable? Is there any invulnerable weapon? Not even the igloo in the frozen north can be made invulnerable. Certainly those of us down home in the path of that hurricane know that man devises or plans, but a superior power acts. And a superior power decides in the military. Nothing is invulnerable. But he says they are the best protected and least vulnerable of all carriers ever designed.

The second ship of this class, the CVAN—

That is the one in the bill—

is scheduled for delivery in 1974.

And he says what it will replace. That, of course, was already known. He continued:

Were the Navy required to operate a smaller carrier force, the improved capabilities of the *Nimitz* class would become even more important.

I hope we do operate a smaller number of carriers, and I believe we will. The best way to get the number reduced is to have this modern type, with its additional capabilities. He continued:

The 3 *Nimitz*-class attack carriers are the only ones authorized or planned from FY 1964 through 1972, a period of 9 years; this will average out to but one new attack carrier every 3 years.

He says further:

If we do not continuously modernize our attack carrier force, its ability to protect our naval and overseas military forces and the logistic lifeline for our military and industrial needs against the increasing capabilities of potential enemies will be degraded.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Speaking on this question of modernization and improvement, I think the one thing that we have to bear in mind is that we cannot rest on the accomplishments of the past to guarantee the security of the future.

Take the *Enterprise*. The *Enterprise* was the first nuclear propelled aircraft carrier. The *Enterprise* has eight reactors, and its maneuverability, was proved in the Mediterranean and in the Cuban crises. It has been further proved in Vietnam.

But now, the *Nimitz*, instead of the eight reactors, will have two reactors. Mind you what improvement has been made in such a short time. The *Nimitz* will hit the water, I understand, in 1971.

Mr. STENNIS. The first one, that is right.

Mr. PASTORE. Those two reactors have the same power of the eight reactors in the *Enterprise*. And do you know what those two reactors are the equivalent of, in power? They tell me the power of those two reactors is equivalent to that of the line of oil freight cars stretching a distance of 500 miles. That is the power, and that shows the progress that we have made. If we stop at this point, what we are going to do is rely on the past to protect us in the future. That is the mistake of stopping now.

Furthermore, we have already invested, in this new aircraft carrier, almost $130 million, that will go right down the drain. The question here is, How far can we go in flirting with disaster when it comes to the security of this country?

I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island very much for his splendid contribution. No one is more knowledgeable as a legislator—I make no exceptions—in this field and related fields than is the Senator from Rhode Island, who has contributed so very much indeed as chairman, for a while, and then as a member of our Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 20 minutes of the Senator from Mississippi have expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask for 1 additional minute. We are not under controlled time, but I shall take 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the argument made by the Air Force—I have heard it over and over—is that they are able to take care of all situations that we might have anywhere with their ground bases.

Fine as they are, our land bases overseas have shrunk from 105 to 35 in the last 10 years, in round numbers. I remember being in France, as I have stated before so many times, where so many of our air bases were dedicated—I know of nearly a billion dollars that we spent there on those bases—and now we cannot even land there without a permit. We cannot even fly over the airspace above France, the heart of Europe, without getting a permit. Of course, this is a diplomatic thing, but you have to fly. Thirty days in advance, you have to get that.

It shows that we are skating on the thinnest possible ice and are talking about an imaginary thing when we talk about having airbases wherever we might need them.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in an effort to clear up what I think was a misunderstanding this morning, before today's debate ends on this issue, I should like to clarify remarks made this morning by the Senator from Maryland concerning Mr. George Wilson's article published in the Washington Post entitled "Air Force May Spur Navy Carrier Debate." The article was printed in the RECORD as evidence of Air Force efforts to discredit the capability of the naval air force.

Part of the information was taken from a letter from the Air Force to a U.S. Senator in response to these three questions:

(1) What is the number of overseas-air bases that the Air Force has relinquished since the Korean war? Why were these bases given up? And has the release of these bases jeopardized the USAF tactical air capability?

I stress and underline the words "the U.S. Air Force tactical air capability." It does not say anything about the level of the Naval Air Force tactical capability.

The other questions were:

(2) What is meant by the "KIT" method of quick construction of land bases as briefly described in the August 25 edition of the Washington Post?

(3) What is the capability of the Air Force's new air superiority fighter, the F–15?

The Air Force capability refers only to Air Force tactical capability. In fact, the words "Navy carrier" are not even contained in the letter. Consequently, to quote from the letter and then refer to it as an "Air Force paper likely to have short- and long-range impact on the debate on the American Military Establishment" is an incredible exaggeration.

More specifically, I feel that in his statement made his morning, the distinguished Senator from Maryland clearly implied that the Air Force was attempting to discredit and replace the Air Force carrier. Such implication is erroneous.

Air power, land-based and sea-based, each has its separate and distinct role to play.

The Air Force clearly recognizes the complementary nature of the mission in support of the aircraft carrier and the mission of the U.S. Tactical Air Force.

I have some confidential information with me which, if I eliminate enclosure No. 1, is no longer classified. Enclosure

No. 1 has to do with major base disclosures, going into it item by item.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter addressed, "Dear Senator HATFIELD," from the Air Force.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 2, 1969.

Hon. MARK HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: A few days ago, Mr. Michaelson of your Staff asked the Air Force to provide you with information regarding air bases overseas, quick construction of bases and the performance capability of the F–15. More specifically, I understand your questions were:

1. What is the number of overseas air bases the Air Force has relinquished since the Korean War; why were these bases given up; and has the loss of these bases jeopardized the USAF tactical air capability?

2. What is meant by the "Kit" method of quick construction of land bases as briefly described in the August 25 edition of the *Washington Post?*

3. What is the capability of the Air Force's new air superiority fighter, the F–15?

Although an attempt was made to keep the answers to these questions unclassified, to be completely responsive, an additional classified answer was required for the F–15 because some of the performance parameters of the aircraft are classified and similarly, a portion of the information relating to base closures is classified.

If we can be of any further assistance, please call.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. MURPHY,
Major General, U.S. Air Force, Director, Legislative Liaison.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I will eliminate enclosure No. 1 which will downgrade the classification from confidential to normal. I then ask unanimous consent that attachment No. 2 and attachment No. 3 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOTAL NUMBER OF AIRFIELDS BY COUNTRY AND BY LENGTH RUNWAY (FEET)

	0–3,000	3,000–5,000	5,000–8,000	8,000 or over
Aden		1	1	1
Afghanistan		2	4	5
Algeria		1	12	15
Angola		6	8	4
Argentina	4	11	31	11
Australia		11	54	14
Austria	1	4	6	1
Antarctica			3	3
Azores			1	2
Bahrein			1	1
Belgium		4	1	9
Bahamas		1	4	3
Br. Guiana			1	
Bornholm			1	
Balearic			1	2
Bechuanaland		1	2	
Bolivia	1	9	5	2
Burma		6	7	3
British Honduras	1		1	
N. Borneo		1	2	
Brazil		23	37	7
West Berlin			3	
Brunei			2	
Canary			1	2
Central African Republic			3	1
Ceylon		1	3	1
Chad			5	1
Chile	1	9	16	2
Cocos Island			1	1
Caroline			1	
Cameroon			3	1
Canada	24	82	101	28
Columbia		2	9	3
Congo, Republic of			3	1

TOTAL NUMBER OF AIRFIELDS BY COUNTRY AND BY LENGTH RUNWAY (FEET)—Continued

	0–3,000	3,000–5,000	5,000–8,000	8,000 or over
Crete			1	3
Costa Rica		1	1	
Corsica			2	1
Cuba		8	8	8
Congo BC		1	10	3
Cyprus			1	2
Dahomey			1	
Denmark	3	4	1	8
Dodecanese		4	1	
Dominican Republic		1	5	1
Easter			1	
Ecuador			2	3
Egypt		1	6	29
Ireland		1	3	1
E. Pakistan		1	4	2
El Salvador			1	
Ethiopia			2	4
Finland		2	12	6
France	3	10	51	17
Fiji		3	3	1
Far West Indies			1	1
Gambia			1	
Gabon Republic		2	1	1
Ghana		2	1	1
Gibraltar			1	
Greenland			1	7
Gotland	1		1	
Greece		7	2	11
Guatemala		2	2	1
Guinea			1	2
Federal Republic of Germany	35	23	27	34
Haiti			1	1
Honduras			2	
Indonesia	1	15	16	7
IFNI			1	
Iceland		1	2	1
India	2	11	36	38
Iraq			3	6
Iran		1	8	13
Israel	1	2	1	5
Italy	1	5	16	21
Ivory Coast		1	1	1
Japan	6	26	13	14
Jammu Kashmir			1	2
Jamaica	2		4	
Kenya		2	3	2
South Korea	5	6	5	6
Laos	1	5	6	
Line Island Group			1	
Leeward			2	
Libya			4	2
Malagasy Republic		7	2	3
Madiera			2	
Malaya		2	4	2
Marshall			2	
Malta			1	
Morocco	1	1	7	3
Mauritania			7	
Midway Island			1	
Mexico	1	7	33	7
Mozambique		4	8	3
Netherlands		1	3	12
New Hebrides			2	
Nigeria			8	1
Niger			5	1
Norway			9	11
Nepal	1	7	1	
Nicaragua	1		2	1
New Guinea		1	8	
Nyasaland		1	1	
New Zealand	2	28	10	2
Muscat-Oman		1	2	1
Paraguay	3	3	1	1
Peru	1	1	3	10
Phoenix			1	
Philippines		10	6	6
West Pakistan		1	9	8
Panama	1	2	2	2
Puerto Rico		4	2	3
Portugal		1	3	8
Port Guinea			1	
Panama Canal Zone			1	1
Ric Muni			1	1
Ryukyu Islands		1	3	3
Mali		2	3	1
N. Rhodesia		1	3	2
S. Rhodesia		1	3	1
Solomon		2	3	
Sardinia			2	1
Sarawak		3	1	
Sicily		1	3	2
Society		1	4	1
Senegal		1	2	1
Somali			1	2
Singapore		1	1	2
Spain		4	9	17
Saudi Arabia			3	8
Sp. Sahara			2	
Sao Tome			1	
Sudan			5	
Sweden	2	4	47	6
Syria			2	9
Switzerland	5	5	10	6
Tanganyika		1	3	
Trucial Oman			1	2
Thailand		7	4	9

TOTAL NUMBER OF AIRFIELDS BY COUNTRY AND BY LENGTH RUNWAY (FEET)—Continued

	0–3,000	3,000–5,000	5,000–8,000	8,000 or over
Turkey		4	9	20
Togo			1	
Tunisia			3	1
Taiwan	1	2	3	10
Union South Africa	1	7	23	8
United Kingdom	4	41	88	33
Upper Volta			1	1
Uruguay	2	4	2	
Venezuela		4	7	5
South Vietnam	7	22	6	8
Virgin Islands			2	
Windward			1	
Western Samoa		1	3	
Yemen		1	1	2
Yugoslavia	2	7	7	15
Zanzibar		1		
Lebanon				3
Luxembourg				1
Wake Island				1
Maldive Islands				1
Netherlands Antilles				2
French Somaliland				1
St. Helena				1
Sierra Leone				1
American Samoa				1
Trinidad				1
Uganda				2
Rwanda		1		1
St. Pierre		1		1
Port Timor		1		1
Surinam				1
Qatar				1
Cape Verde				1
Andaman Island				1
Barbados				1
Bermuda				1
Burundi				1
Cambodia				2
Nawpo Shoto Island				1
Faeroe Islands		1		
French Guiana				1
Liberia		1		1
Mascarene Islands		1		2
New Caledonia		1		1
Total	128	541	1,036	685

SUMMARY

Country	Number of major bases [1] Inactivated	Number of major bases [1] Active USAF	Number of active national airfields Longer than 8,000 feet	Number of active national airfields All airfields
Europe:				
France	22	0	17	81
Germany	11	8	34	119
Italy	3	1	21	43
Netherlands	0	1	12	16
Spain	0	2	17	30
United Kingdom	14	9	34	171
Others	0	0	73	226
Subtotal	50	21	208	686
Mediterranean:				
Greece	0	1	11	20
Libya	0	1	3	6
Morocco	4	0	3	11
Saudi Arabia	1	0	8	11
Turkey	0	2	20	33
Others	0	0	98	149
Subtotal	5	4	143	231
Pacific:				
Bonin Is	1	0	0	1
Japan	9	4	14	59
Korea	1	2	6	22
Others	0	18	132	476
Subtotal	11	24	152	558
Others:				
Canada		2	28	235
Miscellaneous	0	10	154	680
Subtotal	1	12	182	915
Total	67	61	685	2,390

[1] Bases in U.S.-owned territory excluded.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I did not mention the "KIT" construction matter that the Washington Post brought up. The Air Force does not

know what the Post is talking about. I am not surprised. That is customary.

I should like to comment on the matter because the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) was present earlier and called for overseas base reduction.

I would point out that since the Korean war, we have inactivated 67 overseas bases, and there remain 61 active overseas Air Force bases. There are 685 overseas national air fields, with longer than 8,000-foot runways. There are 2,390 airfields in all.

Mr. President, I will eliminate any reference to the F–15 question, because that remains, as it should remain from the nature of the information, a highly classified one. However, I did want to get this matter disposed of today, because I felt distinctly that it was an effort to generate a feud between the Air Force and the Navy. And I have sat through too many hearings to think for one moment that the Navy is out to get the Air Force, or that the Air Force is out to get the Navy. They work in a complementary way. There are differences, of course; there always will be argument about weapons.

I did not want the debate to proceed further with Senators thinking that the Navy was out to get the Air Force, or that the Air Force was out to get the Navy. Such is not the case.

There is a distinct difference in the basic need for sea-air power as brought out very distinctly by the chairman of the committee.

When I note that the basic requirement of sea-air power is to provide air superiority for the fleet and for the conveyance of merchandise and troops and heavy cargo overseas, their distinct use for tactical operation is largely for attacking tactical targets that we cannot attack from land because of the long distance involved.

I cite the part played by the Navy in basing the carriers in the Tonkin Gulf and eliminating the need for the U.S. tactical aircraft to make long missions which require refueling.

Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to clear up this matter.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to commend the proponents of amendment No. 136 for drastically changing their original proposal. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey have demonstrated wisdom and foresight by rewriting their amendment.

As originally proposed, Mr. President, there were two items out of 14 that the Comptroller General could properly perform.

The amendment as rewritten now seeks to have the Comptroller General investigate and report on only those two of the original 14 tasks.

The amendment as originally prepared, after striking $377 million from the bill, sought to impose the Comptroller General as a new form of congressional systems analysts reminiscent of that office that has caused such fearful headaches during the McNamara regime.

I am particularly delighted that the original amendment has been withdrawn because the Congress never intended that the General Accounting Office should second guess the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is what that amendment sought to accomplish.

The rewriting of amendment No. 136 also demonstrates that the debate on the C–5A aircraft has provided a warning signal that the meat-ax approach is an exercise in futility.

Mr. President, I would like also to say that I am pleased that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has now returned to his earlier thinking about the proper functions of the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office.

During hearings on Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969 in May of this year before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, Senator MONDALE addressed the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States as follows, from page 367 of the printed hearings:

> I don't wish to be unduly critical. I think that it was the Congress that insinuated the General Accounting Office in this whole arena. But I have grave doubts that this is the role that the General Accounting Office should perform because these are political judgments. These are judgments in addition that require the sophistication of professionals in education, in health, in legal services, that involve a lifetime of the most rigorous sophisticated academic and practical background coupled with experience.

I agree wholeheartedly with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Thank you, Mr. President. During the debate I will further comment on the subject of this amendment.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the pending matter is the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New Jersey, and I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on Friday the time on the amendment be controlled, commencing at 10:30 a.m. I understand that an order already has been entered that the Senate convene at 10 a.m. on Friday.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) be recognized first to speak on the amendment; that the time, beginning at 10:30, be controlled by and be equally divided between the proponents of the amendment and the Senator acting as floor manager of the bill on behalf of the committee; and that we vote at 3 p.m., not before, on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

> *Ordered*, That effective at 10:30 o'clock a.m., Friday, September 12, 1969, further debate on pending amendment No. 146, offered by the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), to S. 2546, the military procurement proponents (Mr. MONDALE) and the opponauthorization bill, be limited to 4½ hours to be equally divided and controlled by the ents (Mr. STENNIS), and that the Senate proceed to vote on said amendment No. 146 at 3 o'clock p.m. on that day.
>
> *Ordered further*, That at 10:30 o'clock a.m., Friday next, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) be recognized by the Chair.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I speak in opposition to the pending amendment which would strike from the fiscal year 1970 Department of Defense authorization bill the funds necessary to build our third nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier, CVAN–69.

My opposition to this amendment derives from three main considerations:

First, there are only two practical ways to project modern tactical airpower into those parts of the world where we have vital interests—tactical aircraft flying from Air Force land airbases and tactical aircraft flying from the Navy's attack carriers. The United States could not build the number of land airbases around the world that would be required to meet all of our tactical air requirements. In fact, we are experiencing continuous erosion in the number of overseas bases available to us. For example, at the end of the Korean war we had 551 overseas bases. Today we have less than 173. Operational U.S. Air Force overseas bases have declined in number from 105 in 1957 to 35.

The difficulties involved in keeping foreign bases are becoming increasingly evident as the United States tries to negotiate or renegotiate foreign base agreements. Also, land bases on foreign soil are vulnerable to political action. Regardless of treaties or agreements, a nation can unilaterally cancel a treaty and our bases in that nation are no longer available. This happened to us, for example, in Morocco and France. Furthermore, the use of land bases can be temporarily denied to us for political reasons—and without warning.

Naval attack carriers, by contrast, are mobile airbases which can be kept in home waters or deployed to meet contingencies, without political involvement. Operating from international waters, the carriers are normally unencumbered by overflight clearances and base restrictions so frequently encountered by land-based air.

Second, if any reduction in our carrier force level is decided upon in the next several years, I believe it should be made by retiring our World War II carriers, not by canceling or delaying the construction of our new nuclear-powered attack carriers.

The Navy has built nine modern attack carriers since 1952, including the nuclear-powered *Enterprise*. The remaining six attack carriers operating today were launched during or shortly after World War II; four of these are of the *Essex* class.

It is not practical to further modernize the *Essex*-class attack carriers. They cannot operationally support several of the new aircraft: F–4 Phantom II, RA–5C Vigilante, A–6 Intruder, E–2 Hawkeye, F–14. The problem is that aircraft size and speed have become too much for the smaller size decks of the World War II carriers.

There are three carriers in the *Midway* class which were laid down at the peak of World War II. These ships are

larger than the *Essex* class, but much smaller than the *Forrestal, Enterprise,* and *Nimitz* classes. The Department of Defense had planned to modernize all three of these carriers over the next several years. However, the modernization of the *Midway* which is nearing completion has turned out to be so expensive that plans to modernize her sister ships, the *Franklin D. Roosevelt* and *Coral Sea,* have been abandoned.

The *Nimitz*-class carriers incorporate the most modern technological advances including nuclear propulsion and the capability to handle and support the newest tactical aircraft. In designing the CVAN–69 the Navy has drawn on many lessons learned in carrier operations in the Vietnam war, particularly in the areas of command and control, intelligence processing, ordnance handling, firefighting, and damage control.

Also, since the nuclear carrier does not have to carry propulsion fuel oil, it can carry much larger amounts of aircraft fuel and other combat consumables which greatly increases its combat capability. The nuclear cores being built at the present time for the *Nimitz* and the CVAN–69 will fuel the ships for at least 13 years of normal operations.

If it proves necessary for us to operate a smaller carrier force in the future, it will become even more important that each ship in the operating forces be as up to date and capable as possible. In this regard, it should be noted that proceeding with the CVAN–69 will not increase the number of carriers in the Navy's active inventory. When this carrier joins the fleet in 1974 it will replace the *Bon Homme Richard*—which will then be 30 years old—a veteran of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam.

Third, this ship—CVAN–69—has been in the 5-year defense plan for 4 years. Each year the need for the ship has been thoroughly reviewed and reconfirmed by the Department of Defense and Congress.

Congress has already appropriated a total of $132.9 million for this ship over a 2-year period. The propulsion machinery for the CVAN–69 is well along in fabrication. The procurement of the remaining components and the ship construction are carefully sequenced with the *Nimitz* for maximum economy—this economy can be achieved only if the funds required for this ship are retained in the fiscal year 1970 budget.

To delay this ship now by further study—as would be done if the proposed amendment were adopted—would waste tens of millions of dollars due to the disruption and inefficiency that would be forced into the ship construction by the holdup.

Mr. President, I cannot see that it makes any sense to delay or otherwise interfere with the construction of this *Nimitz*-class carrier. I shall vote against the proposed amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for his very excellent presentation as to the reasons the pending amendment should be defeated.

Mr. President, I support the authorization of $377 million for the CVAN–69 nuclear aircraft carrier. It is a vitally important part of the military procurement program and will provide an equally important element of our seapower. Our Nation must remain militarily strong if it is to remain free.

The aircraft carrier is the primary striking force of our Navy. Our aircraft carriers must be modern if our Navy is to be modern.

The carrier proposed for fiscal year 1970 originally was scheduled to be funded in fiscal year 1969. Congress already has appropriated nearly $133 million for this carrier, making a total cost of $510 million.

The cost of a modern, nuclear aircraft carrier is great. But the stakes involved in control of the seas are even greater.

The distinguished senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) recently used these words in discussing nuclear submarines:

> Whoever controls the seas will control the overriding question of peace or war.

Because of sea power, I strongly urge authorization of the new nuclear carrier, which will be our third such ship.

I speak as one who does not believe in blank checks for Pentagon projects: I already have voted for a reduction of $2 billion in the current military procurement authorization.

Mr. President, it is important to put in perspective the money involved in the total procurement program. The budget submitted by the administration of President Johnson in January called for a $23 billion outlay for military hardware, research, and development. When President Nixon came into office, this was reviewed and the Nixon administration brought in a budget of $22 billion.

The Armed Services Committee, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), went very carefully into the military procurement program, and the committee recommends to the Senate that $2 billion be taken out of the request from the administration, leaving a military procurement authorization bill of $20 billion. Thus, the committee favors a reduction, and the Senator from Virginia favors a reduction. We favor cutting the fat out of the military budget, but we do not favor cutting out the muscle.

The carrier now being considered is the second in the *Nimitz* class. The name ship of the class, the *Nimitz,* now is under construction. The *Nimitiz* will be our second nuclear-powered carrier—the *Enterprise,* of course, already is in action—and the ship requested in the current authorization will be Navy's third.

This program is essential if we are to maintain mobile bases for our tactical aircraft.

Tactical aircraft are vital to the defense of our national interests. Tactical aircraft, like any other, need a place to land and a place from which to take off. Since 1954, the United States has lost two-thirds of its overseas bases, and there is nothing in the world political scene that indicates a future reversal of this trend.

The aircraft carrier, therefore, is the only assured overseas "base" for tactical aircraft that can be bought today. The carrier does not come cheap, but the cost is not prohibitive, considering the stakes that are involved.

It has been proposed that a review be made of the role of carriers in contingencies, the vulnerability of carriers, the policy of replacing carriers on a one-for-one basis and the foreign policy implications of the carrier force.

This kind of review is being carried on continually. I believe that the whole spectrum of American foreign policy and military posture should be under continuous review by the Congress and the administration.

However, even though such a review is carried out, it would not eliminate the need for this carrier.

For one thing, no review of the international situation and our military posture can result in an accurate prediction as to when, or where, or under what conditions wars may be fought in the years to come. The only way to insure that a war will be fought in a particular place is to start it yourself, and that is not the policy of the United States.

On the contrary, our policy is to deter war—either limited or general—to the very best of our ability.

I do not favor extension of U.S. military commitments overseas. As a matter of fact, I feel that this country already is overextended in its commitments.

But this does not mean that the United States can stage an instant withdrawal from the world at large, nor does it mean that we can let our guard down.

I do not favor a "world policeman" role for this country.

I have felt from the beginning that the involvement of the United States in a ground war in Southeast Asia was a grave error of judgment. But in this uncertain and imperfect world, I want our Nation to remain militarily strong.

There is a critical difference between declining to police the world because we do not choose to do so, and declining because we are unable to do so.

Choosing not to do so is an act of judgment, which implies the existence of an American deterrent that discourages adventurism on the part of potential enemies.

Being unable to do so implies a posture of impotence that can only encourage aggressors.

We must be in a position of choice, not a position of impotence.

We cannot escape our position of responsibility in this imperfect world. I do not favor a policy of intervention—certainly not a policy of unilateral intervention—but I believe in looking at the world as it is, not as we might wish it to be.

In the world as it is, the aircraft carrier is an important instrument of national policy.

Before the Senate now is an amendment proposed by the Senators from Minnesota and New Jersey which would eliminate the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier from this year's military procurement authorization.

I do not believe that the course recommended in this amendment is either wise or safe.

The sponsors of the amendment maintain that the status and mission of our

carrier force should be reviewed. I do not disagree.

As a matter of fact, all weapons systems should be under continuous review. The Navy, the Defense Department, the President, and the Congress have the obligation to see that our defense dollars are wisely spent.

But this should be a continuing process. Such questions as the mission of carriers, their overall effectiveness, their relative vulnerability, and the comparative effectiveness of alternate weapons systems should be reviewed regularly.

However, this is being done. The Defense Department constantly weighs the effectiveness of weapons systems against their cost.

So far, experience has taught us that the aircraft carrier is a valuable and versatile member of our weapons family, and that nuclear power has great advantages over conventional power. That is why the Department of Defense now supports this third nuclear aircraft carrier.

Mr. President, at this point, I might mention that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), in making his presentation today, pointed out that the then Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, recommended in 1964 that the number of aircraft carriers be reduced. That is an accurate statement by the Senator from Minnesota.

What I think should be emphasized is that while he recommended that the number of carriers be reduced, he equally strongly recommended that three new nuclear carriers be built, because he recognized, as I think most officials in the Department of Defense recognize, that if we are going to have a Navy, we had better have a modern Navy.

In addition to Defense Department studies, there is the annual review of military spending proposals by the authorizing and appropriating Committees of Congress, and debates like the ones that have occurred on the floors of the House and the Senate over the past 6 to 9 weeks.

If it is true that weapons systems once were automatically approved by the services, the Secretary of Defense and the Congress, that certainly is not the case today. I should say at this point that I heartily approve of the close scrutiny now being given military appropriations.

I think it is well that the Senator from Minnesota presented this amendment. I think it is well that the Senator from Wisconsin presented the various amendments he has presented. I think it is well that the Senate and the Congress debate fully matters of military appropriations, because we should want to give the taxpayers a dollar's worth for every dollar of their funds that is spent; and that can only be done if there is a careful review on the part of the Congress. I approve of this debate. But, while I approve of this debate as a symbol of alertness to possible waste in the military, I cannot approve of the amendment proposed by my distinguished colleagues from Minnesota and New Jersey.

One of the announced aims of the pending amendment is economy. But even as an economy move, the amendment makes no sense.

The fact is that $133 million already has been spent for a second *Nimitz* carrier. If the carrier is eliminated from the budget, this money will be down the drain.

If the construction of this carrier is delayed, of course, the cost will go up.

Of course, it might make sense to sacrifice $133 million if there were real reason to believe that the new carrier will not be needed. But this is not the case.

I believe the role of aircraft carriers and the need for this particular nuclear carrier have been sufficiently studied and is sufficiently established.

However, if the Senate should decide that additional study is required, without delaying the second *Nimitz* carrier, I would have no serious objection. I do not believe the study would be harmful. There may be some value in a review of the need for 15 carriers.

Let us indulge in fantasy for a moment. Let us suppose that the proposed study is carried out and the verdict is that the United States will need only three aircraft carriers in the 1970's and beyond. Personally, I would call into question the judgment of anyone who would come to such a conclusion, but for the sake of argument, let us assume for a moment that this unbelievable conclusion is reached and accepted.

How would we go about reducing our future force to three carriers? By keeping the newest, of course, and retiring the older ones.

But it is axiomatic that the smaller your force, the more important its quality. Surely we do not have to prove again, having finally hammered it home even to Mr. McNamara, that nuclear aircraft carriers are the carriers of the future.

The United States now has only one active nuclear-powered carrier, the *Enterprise*. A second, the *Nimitz*, is under construction. That is all we have.

So if this Nation were to have only three modern carriers, carriers with nuclear power—why, even then, the ship proposed in this bill would demand immediate authorization.

Proponents of the amendment now before us maintain that land-based tactical aircraft can do the job of carrier-based aircraft more cheaply and efficiently.

But tactical aircraft based on land cannot substitute for carrier-based forces. As a matter of fact, during World War II and in the Korean war aircraft based on carriers often were essential to provide air superioity in areas. where we seized bases that later became airfields for land-based tactical planes.

I may point out that during the Lebanon crisis, a base was available in Turkey, but the use of this base was denied us because Greece, a NATO ally, refused to allow overflights. Our carrier fleet provided air cover for the Marine landing after the order was issued.

The carrier force which we have today is rapidly aging. Of our 15 attack carriers, seven were built during World War II or shortly thereafter.

I have a list of all of those. Three of them were built 25 years ago. When these are replaced under the program which has been worked out, some of them will be 33 years old before they are taken out of service. I submit that those no longer can be called modern aircraft carriers.

Three of these ships, the *Essex* class, are unable to operate some of the Navy's newest aircraft, including the F–4 Phantom II, A–6 Intruder, and the RA–5C Vigilante. The safety record of these old carriers is unsatisfactory; the landing accident rate aboard these ships is about twice that of their more modern sisters.

It is possible that a review of our foreign policy and overseas commitments may conclude that fewer than 15 attack carriers will be needed in the fleet in the future.

I do not argue as to whether we should have 15 carriers. I do reason we must have some modern, nuclear-powered carriers, and to date, we have only one.

Another is being built and should be in service in 1971, and a third one is the one which is being considered today.

It has seemed to me somewhat sad that the memory of that fine sailor, former President Kennedy, should be honored with an aircraft carrier powered with an outdated propulsion system.

The decision to build the *Kennedy* with oil-fired engines was an error of judgment—nearly all military authorities agree on this point—and it is an error that should not be repeated. It was an error, I might say, not on the part of the professional military leaders, but rather on the part of Secretary of Defense McNamara.

Sooner or later, this new nuclear aircraft carrier proposed in the bill now before the Senate must be built. Delay in providing the necessary funds will only increase the cost and lessen our security.

We have only one nuclear carrier today—the *Enterprise*. The *Nimitz* nears completion, and a second *Nimitz* is the carrier to which the current authorization would apply. Thus, even with the currently sought authorization, we will have only three modern nuclear-powered aircraft carriers.

Unless we want to get out of the seapower business entirely, the very least we can do is have three nuclear-powered modern aircraft carriers.

In analyzing and studying the excellent speech made this morning by the Senator from Minnesota—excellent from his point of view; I heard most of it; I read it twice—what impressed me about that speech was that his main argument is built along the line that we should not have 15 attack carriers.

That is not the point at all, as I see it, Mr. President. The point is, shall we have a modern Navy? It is not a question of how many carriers we should have. That is not the question at issue today. The question at issue today is that we have one modern nuclear-powered carrier now, we have a second one being built, and the question is, Shall a third modern nuclear-powered carrier be built?

That is the issue. It is not the issue whether we should have 15 carriers or 12 carriers or 10 carriers, or whatever. This year, shall we have a modern fleet? Shall we have at least some modern carriers?

I submit that these fossil fuel carriers

cannot be considered to be modern carriers. The only modern carriers are those which are nuclear powered.

Mr. President, I wish to say again that I believe very strongly that Congress has an obligation to cut the fat out of any military budget submitted to Congress. I have voted for very considerable cuts in budgets submitted by President Johnson, and I have voted for cuts in the current budget which has been submitted by President Nixon. I believe in cutting out the fat.

But, Mr. President, we must not cut the muscle. We must not cut the muscle, and I say that if you cut out, eliminate, scuttle the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, we are cutting the muscle of the U.S. Navy.

Mr. President, I was tremendously interested in one aspect—I was interested in many aspects of it, but particularly in one aspect—of the address of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, in which he said—and I read from page 4 of his manuscript—speaking of his amendment:

> This is not an "anti-carrier" amendment, as Navy spokesmen would have us believe. Our amendment in no way suggests that the attack carrier is obsolete or has no viable role in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. President, that is a very significant statement, I believe. And I might say that the able Senator from Minnesota repeated several times in his comments today that he felt that the Navy has an important role to play.

If that is the case—and I think it is—then I say we must have a modern Navy. There are Senators—and many of them have told me so—who do not believe that we should have aircraft carriers. They say there is no need for aircraft carriers, they are obsolete, and we ought to do away with them.

I say that Senators who feel that way certainly should vote for the Mondale-Case amendment. It is the only logical vote for them to cast. But I point out, Mr. President, that Senator MONDALE and Senator CASE do not believe that the Navy is obsolete, and I have just quoted a passage from the speech of the Senator from Minnesota to justify that assertion. They do not believe that the Navy is obsolete and should be done away with. What they do want to do is eliminate from the present authorization bill the funds to construct a third nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.

I can see the point of some Senators who say we should not have aircraft carriers. I do not agree with their view, but at least they have something that they can stand on. They just do not believe in aircraft carriers serving a useful purpose. If they believe that, they ought to vote for the amendment. But I am convinced that the large majority of Senators do not feel that way. Most Senators feel we must have aircraft carriers.

I submit that if we feel we must have aircraft carriers, then it is only logical that we have modern, nuclear-powered ones, and not be forced to utilize carriers which are reaching a high age, and which, as a consequence, are and will continue to be much more costly to operate.

Mr. President, I think it would be unwise if the Senate were to adopt the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I say again, it is not a question—and the amendment is built on this premise—of how many carriers the Navy ought to have. I do not argue whether the Navy should have 15 carriers, 10 carriers, seven carriers, or whatever it should have; but if you concede that the Navy should have carriers, if you concede that we must have carriers if we are to maintain a modern navy, then I submit, Mr. President, that the least number of modern nuclear-powered carriers we can or should have is three.

We have to date one, the *Enterprise*. We have the *Nimitz*, which will be in use in 1971, and the funds for the third nuclear-powered carrier are included in this bill, which the Senate has been debating for the past 8 or 9 weeks.

So, Mr. President, I support the authorization of this third nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier, and I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks about the value of aircraft carriers, I ask unanimous consent that a study of the use of carriers, entitled "Carrier Employment Since 1950," by Adm. David L. McDonald, former Chief of Naval Operations, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARRIER EMPLOYMENT SINCE 1950

(By Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, president, U.S. Naval Institute)

At this time of international tensions that require large national investments for defense, at this time when technology makes possible a wide selection of complex, costly weapons, it is well, perhaps, to back off and look at the practical results recently achieved by any given major weapon under consideration. If it is true that the proof of the pudding is in the eating, then it is true that the proof of a weapon is in its employment. Let us examine, then, the employment in recent years of one of the Navy's major weapons—the aircraft carrier.

The end of World War II found the Navy with an inventory of 24 *Essex*-class attack carriers commissioned or building, eight light carriers, 74 escort carriers, and three obsolete prewar carriers. Of the 111 carriers of all types used in the War, 11 were lost in combat, none of which were *Essex*-class. If the performance of carriers in World War II can be summarized in one sentence, it is this—carrier strike forces, Japanese as well as American, always defeated land-based air forces. The issue was in doubt only when they were carriers on both sides of the battle.

At the outbreak of the Korean War in the summer of 1950, the Navy had seven attack carriers, four light carriers and four escort carriers in commission. Three of the attack carriers were of the 45,000-ton *Midway*-class—the *Midway*, *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, and *Coral Sea*, CVBs 41–43, respectively—which had joined the Fleet between 1945 and 1947. The bulk of the force was in the Atlantc or Mediterranean; the Pacific Fleet included only three attack carriers and two escort carriers. The one Pacific Fleet attack carrier west of Pearl Harbor, USS *Valley Forge* (CV–45), was in the South China Sea on 26 June; on the 27th she was ordered to Korean waters. En route, she was diverted to make a show of force in the Taiwan Straits because of possible Chinese Communist invasion preparations. Operating in the Yellow Sea a few days later, she launched the first carrier strikes of the War on 3 and 4 July against Pyongyang, capital of North Korea and focal point of its western railroads. The *Valley Forge* was then ordered south to stand by to counter possible hostilities in the Taiwan Straits. Back in the Sea of Japan on 18 July, she supported the landings at Pohang. Remaining in the area for several days, she operated to the south and west of the peninsula with offensive missions against enemy troops and supply lines in support of the holding actions of Americans and South Korean ground forces.

The *Valley Forge* remained the only engaged carrier until the beginning of August when another Pacific Fleet attack carrier arrived. The build-up continued with two escort carriers whose ASW aircraft had been replaced by Marine squadrons and by the third Pacific Fleet attack carrier—the USS *Philippine Sea* (CV–47)—which arrived in mid-September. The first Atlantic Fleet attack carrier—the USS *Leyte* (CV–32) arrived in early October. At this point, four of the seven attack carriers in operation at the beginning of the War were committed to Korean operations; the fifth and sixth were in the Mediterranean, and the seventh was operating in the Caribbean.

In the meantime, reinforcements were arriving from the United States, and an amphibious force was organized to land at Inchon, behind the front and halfway up the west coast. After delivering a capacity load of ammuntion, 145 F–51s for the U.S. Air Force, and a number of radar vans, jeeps, and other material, from Alameda, California, to Yokosuka, Japan, the USS *Boxer* (CV–21) returned to Alameda for reloading and rejoined the forces in the Western Pacific just in time to participate in the landing. Under cover of naval gunfire and sea-based aircraft from three attack carriers and two escort carriers, the landing force went ashore at Inchon on 15 September and pressed inland toward Seoul.

The fighting during this period, ranging as it did from the retreat to Pusan to the Inchon invasion, comprehended a number of interesting characteristics. The final North Korean drive to the Pusan perimeter resulted in the withdrawal of all Air Force fighter bombers to Japanese bases, and this reduced the payloads and loiter time available for close support. Carrier-based aircraft thereafter provided a substantial advantage in sortie rates, weapons, and time on station, but it proved difficult to exploit this. Even relatively modest numbers of aircraft tended to saturate the existing air control system (although targets were not lacking). Action reports of the period contain frequent complaints of the inability of the control system to absorb profitably naval close support missions.

Following the Inchon landings our forces moved rapidly toward the Yalu River. Victory appeared imminent, so the *Boxer* was permitted to return to the United States for her delayed overhaul. The *Valley Forge* was also ordered home on 21 November.

Chinese Communist forces from Manchuria attacked en masse on 26 November. In addition to throwing back the Eighth Army in the west, they succeeded in cutting off the Tenth Corps near the Chosin Reservoir. At this point, with land-based tractical air being pushed off advanced bases, the situation was critical; with only the *Leyte* and the *Philippine Sea* on the line, reinforcement was urgently required. The USS *Prince-*

ton (CV–37), freshly out of mothballs and already on the way, arrived on 2 December. A fourth attack carrier having just arrived in San Diego on 1 December, embarked the *Boxer* Air Group and returned to action on 22 December in time to cover the last days of the evacuation. Marine Corps squadrons ashore, now without airfields, were used to fill empty deck spaces on three carriers offshore (two escort carriers and one light carrier) and continued their support missions. For 16 successive days, the surrounded Tenth Corps received on the order of 220 close support sorties a day with a record peak of 315 on one day at the height of the breakout. Each carrier-based sortie remained on station from one to 1.5 hours and made between five and nine attack passes. Over three-quarters of these sorties were provided by carriers, and it is unlikely that the Tenth Corps would have broken out to the coast without them. As a result of the severe losses inflicted on the Chinese by the Tenth Corps and tactical air, the subsequent evacuation of over 100,000 troops and their full equipment was accomplished with negligible loss.

Carrier operations in the remaining years of the Korean War emphasized sustained interdiction of the logistic net in the eastern half of Korea. When the Chinese undertook offensive ground action there were diversions to close air support and to airfield neutralization during the periodic Chinese efforts to regain air superiority. The fact that the front line was perpendicular to the coast line gave carrier aircraft shorter radii and therefore higher payloads and sortie rates for many interdiction and airfield targets. Throughout 1952 and 1953, about half of the Pacific Fleet carriers were maintained in Korean waters.

Of the 11 attack carriers which ultimately saw action in Korea, only four were in active status at the start of the War. The carrier force level rose during the three years of war from seven at the beginning to 18 at the end by reactivating ships from the Reserve Fleet inventory which had been created as a result of World War II.

The Korean Armistice went into effect in July 1953. Soon thereafter, the Communist effort was stepped up in Southeast Asia. In response, the Navy shifted the bulk of its Western Pacific carrier forces to the south. During the desperate battle of Dien Bien Phu in May 1954, two attack carriers were standing by to intervene on behalf of the entrapped French and Vietnamese forces had a decision been made to do so.

The next major employment of attack carriers occurred in 1955, north of the Taiwan Straits. The Chinese Communists assaulted and seized one of the Tachen Islands. Of the nine attack carriers in the Pacific Fleet, five were quickly assembled off the Tachens to cover another amphibious evacuation. The commitment of this major naval force unmistakably indicated U.S. willingness to intervene, and the 1,800 sorties flown in a week also clearly demonstrated a capability to intervene effectively without recourse to nuclear weapons. The over-all posture of the carrier force at this time was as follows:

In commission	16
Overseas	7
Coastal waters	7
Overhaul	2

Active intervention in the Taiwan area was again necessary in 1958. The incident also involved coastal islands and was accompanied by renewed activity in the Straits, a build-up of forces on the Chinese mainland, and repeated announcements that Formosa would be "liberated." The timing may have been influenced by the simultaneous involvement of U.S. naval forces in the Lebanon crisis in the Mediterranean. If this was an attempt by the Communists to catch U.S. naval forces off guard, it failed. In fact, an immediate move was made to improve the readiness posture in the Western Pacific by sailing the USS *Lexington* (CVA–16) (when, in October 1952, CVs and CVBs were officially designated as CVs, they became in name what they had been in fact—*attack* aircraft carriers) from San Diego on 17 July for that purpose.

On 15 July with the situation in Lebanon rapidly approaching the crisis state, President Dwight D. Eisenhower responded affirmatively to President Camille Chamoun's appeal for intervention. At this time we had two attack carriers deployed in the Mediterranean out of a total of six in the Atlantic Fleet. Twelve hours after the President's order was issued, these two carriers supported U.S. Marine Corps landings to seize the Beirut airport. U.S. Army troops were air-lifted into the Marine-held airport four days later, on 19 July. Clearances on over-flights and landing rights were required by several European, African, and Middle Eastern nations. Since these did not affect carrier operations, the Navy retained air support responsibility until 5 September.

Turning back to the Pacific, the Communists began shelling the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, off the Chinese mainland, on 23 August 1958, thus preventing the logistic support of Nationalist garrisons there. When the Seventh Fleet intervened, all the ingredients of all-out war were present.

The pattern of Fleet operations that developed concentrated the attack carrier task groups on an arc around Formosa with their activity designed to make the enemy fully aware of both their presence and their strength. Carrier aircraft covered surface units escorting Chinese Nationalist logistic forces in international waters en route to and from the island groups under fire. U.S. support helped to keep the islands from falling to the Communists.

On the day the shelling of Quemoy and Matsu began, we had 15 attack carriers on active duty and they were located as follows:

Eastern Mediterranean (Lebanon area)	[1] 2
Eastern Atlantic	1
East coast	[2] 2
Overhaul east coast	1
Total	6
Western Pacific (Quemoy-Matsu)	3
En route western Pacific	2
West coast	[2] 4
Total	9

[1] One CVA sailed five days later for WestPac via Suez, as her relief arrived in the Mediterranean.

[2] One CVA on each coast was conducting refresher training subsequent to major overhaul.

The situation again stabilized and the immediate threat of an over-water invasion subsided. Communist forces kept the issue alive, however. Unable to achieve control of Formosa Strait and the coastal water of the East China Sea, they turned with renewed effort to expand southward on the mainland. Without challenging the naval forces present, they waged war in Vietnam, in Laos, and on the borders of India. None of the countries in Southeast Asia escaped their persistent aggressiveness.

During this general period, the carrier forces had been undergoing a gradual change in character and capabilities. Four *Forrestal*-class attack carriers—the *Forrestal, Saratoga, Ranger,* and *Independence,* CVAs 59–62, respectively—joined the Fleet between October 1955 and January 1959. Two improved *Forrestal*-class carriers—the *Kitty Hawk* and the *Constellation,* CVAs 63 and 64 were commissioned in 1961, as was the nuclear-powered USS *Enterprise* (CVAN–65). In response to announced national policy, the emphasis on nuclear delivery capabilities grew steadily. Aircraft primarily designed for nuclear strikes, such as the A–3, were introduced in quantity. Efforts were made to develop improved weapons like Bullpup despite increasing pressure to economize on conventional capabilities.

In 1960, a major short-term build-up of U.S. retaliatory capability was undertaken in response to Soviet pressure on Berlin. Among other emergency measures taken was a major increase in the degree to which the carrier force was committed to a nuclear retaliatory role. Most noticeable was the deployment of an additional carrier to the Mediterranean bringing the total there to three. This carrier and one of the three carriers in the Far East were loaded with air wings which consisted almost entirely of attack aircraft. This emergency posture was maintained from mid-1960 to mid-1961, and provided for overseas deployment of six of the 15 available carriers during most of the period. The protracted commitment placed a severe strain on Fleet resources.

During the spring of 1961, carriers were involved in readiness operations in the Caribbean and Western Atlantic, which did not receiver public notice. This is an illustration of the discreet manner in which aircraft carriers can be employed.

A more recent crisis in which carriers participated involved Cuba. In October 1962, the late President John F. Kennedy demanded the removal of Soviet missiles clandestinely introduced into the island and took firm measures to back up his demand. The USS *Enterprise* (CVAN–65) and the USS *Independence* (CVA–62) played major roles in the Quarantine action and they, along with the *Lexington,* would have supported the landings in Cuba had the President made a decision to invade. The adaptability and flexibility of the sea-air team was demonstrated by reassigning the *Lexington,* on duty as the Naval Air Training carrier, temporarily to attack carrier duty with an Air Wing embarked from a carrier in overhaul. During the Quarantine, the *Enterprise* and the *Independence* were at sea for 49 and 41 consecutive days respectively without relief or in-port replenishment, and their air wings averaged 120 flights per day. Because of the possibility of Soviet moves elsewhere, for example against Turkey, the two attack carriers in the Mediterranean were maintained on station. Similar contingencies in the Pacific motivated the movement of a carrier to the Hawaiian area to reduce the time required to reinforce the three carriers already in the Western Pacific. The resulting posture is summarized below:

Active carriers	16
Committed to Cuban operation	3
Deployed overseas	6
Coastal waters and overhaul	7

There were other crises and incidents in which attack carriers played important roles.

For almost three years following the 1948 break between Moscow and Belgrade there was a steady military build up in the East European Satellites. This was coupled with economic, ideological, and implied military pressure. In the politically critical spring of 1951, the United States suddenly doubled its Mediterranean Fleet by having the forces scheduled to relieve arrive about six weeks ahead of time and by retaining the forces due to be relieved for several weeks beyond their normal tour. In November, the United States formally committed itself to provide military assistance to Yugoslavia. A month later, a cruise by Marshal Tito in the USS *Coral Sea* (CVA–43) further underscored this commitment and advertised the immediate availability of U.S. military power in the Mediterranean even thought we were at the same time fighting a war in Korea.

During the Suez crisis in late October 1956, the USS *Franklin D. Roosevelt* (CVA–42) covered the evacuation by ship of 1,700 U.S. citizens from Israel and Egypt. Both Mediterranean carriers were kept at a high degree of readiness during this crisis.

In April 1957, Sixth Fleet units, including the USS *Forrestal* (CVA–59), were in the Eastern Mediterranean to support President Eisenhower's warning against a threatened take-over of the government of Jordan by the Communists. This show of force was maintained for a week to emphasize U.S. determination that Jordan should remain independent.

In the summer of 1960, the USS *Wasp* (CVS–18) arrived off the Congo to help in the mass evacuation of Americans should that become necessary. She also delivered aviation gasoline to support the United Nation's airlift of Congo forces.

In November 1961, at the request of Guatemala and Nicaragua, President Kennedy ordered a naval patrol of Central American waters to intercept and prevent any Communist-led invasion of those two countries from the sea. The USS *Shangri-La* (CVA–38) immediately initiated the patrol.

Pacific Fleet carriers covered the deployment of the Marines in Thailand in May 1962. This action, in response to the violation of the cease-fire in Laos, followed by major Pathet Lao successes, was designed to give a clear indication of U.S. intentions to defend Thailand, to place a precautionary impact on the situation in Laos, and to maintain positions for quick reaction in the event of a decision calling for further action.

A table of crises showing carrier force levels and inventory is given below:

CRISES INVOLVING CARRIERS

Date	Crisis	Force CVA level	CVA inventory
June 1950	Korea (start)	7	27
March–December 1951	Yugoslavia	14	27
July 1953	Korea (end)	18	27
February 1955	Tachen evacuation.	16	16
October 1956	Suez	19	17
April–May 1957	Jordan	17	17
July–August 1958	Lebanon	15	12
August–December 1958	Quemoy-Matsu.	15	12
July 1960	Congo	14	14
September 1960	Berlin	15	14
November 1960	Guatemala and Nicaragua.	14	14
February–April 1961	Laos	14	17
June 1961	Dominican Republic.	15	17
May 1962	Thailand	15	17
October–December 1962	Cuba	15	15
Present strength		15	15

Inventory includes those CVAs capable of operating all models of CVA aircraft existing in significant numbers in the aircraft inventory. Where force level exceeds inventory, in the table above, obsolete carriers with second line aircraft were included.

It is instructive to review the actual ways in which carriers have been used since 1950 with a view to comparing doctrine with practice. Since the demise of the Japanese Fleet and the appearance of nuclear weapons, carrier force doctrine (in common with many other force doctrines) had emphasized nuclear deterrence, with reduced emphasis on supporting amphibious operations, control of the sea, and showing the flag. All of these missions have continued to engage the Fleet, however. It is striking that amphibious evacuation has been encountered about as often and as importantly as amphibious assault. Perhaps it is natural that this role has been commonly overlooked. Few planners plan on disaster, and the recurrent occurrence of military and political reverses has been submerged by the generally successful results of the series of confrontations during the past decade.

The classic World War II role of the carrier—the gaining and exploiting of air superiority in a local area until forward land-based air could assume the function—has not been exercised in the recent past primarily because such a challenge was declined by the opponents. However, the potential vulnerability of airlifted forces which was inferentially demonstrated in the 1961 Laotian crisis implies that the air superiority mission of the carrier may recur with increasing importance. A new but related role has emerged since 1950 which provides cover for the arrival of airlifted troops and deploying land-based aircraft. In Lebanon, this mission was only an extension of the basic purpose of amphibious operations. But in the 1961 Laotian crisis, the potentially chaotic ground situation at the terminal airfields made troop commanders conscious of the importance of having close air support available immediately upon landing. Similarly, the proximity of the airlift route to Chinese airfields indicated the desirability of carrier-based fighter escort.

A final characteristic of the past decade and a half can also be noted. This was the tendency of crises to occur in the Taiwan Straits coincidentally with the commitment of U.S. forces elsewhere. This happened several times during the Korean War, perhaps for diversionary purposes, and the Quemoy-Matsu crisis appears to have been a test of U.S. ability to respond while major forces were committed in the Middle East.

It is interesting to note that although the carrier force is relatively slow moving in comparison with modern aircraft, carriers have been on the scene early in the development of most major crises. This appears to result from one of the salient characteristics of the force. Although it moves in an assault configuration, essentially ready for maximum effort air operations, it can be moved as ostentatiously or as discreetly as desired. One thing in common about most of these crises is the manner in which carrier forces have been moved toward the trouble spots, is they were in Lebanon, Quemoy-Matsu, and Cuba, on the most tenuous strategic warning and prior to national political decisions. They have also moved in the face of substantial enemy threats as was the case both in Korea and during the Taiwan crises.

Looking back over the last 15 years, what have the attack carriers' missions been and what have their particularly useful characteristics been? The missions can be summarized as follows:

Provide air cover for amphibious landings, as in Inchon, Lebanon, and potentially in Cuba.

Provide close air support for ground forces as in Korea.

Provide U.S. military presence, as during the Dominican Republic crisis, the Tachens evacuation, the Quemoy-Matsu and Lebanon crises.

Provide air cover and ground support for amphibious evacuations as at Hungnam.

Provide air cover for deployment of troops and land-based air as in Korea, Lebanon, and, more recently, Thailand.

Prepare to conduct blockade, search and attack, as was done off Cuba, Guatemala, and Nicaragua.

Contribute to the alert strategic forces for general war.

The particularly useful characteristics of attack carriers have been that they move in an assault configuration prepared, as they were in the Inchon and Lebanon landings, the Tachens and Hungnam evacuations, and the Quemoy-Matsu crisis, to take control of the air against air opposition. As pointed out previously, they move easily to trouble spots on the basis of even tenuous strategic warnings. Lebanon, Quemoy-Matsu, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic are examples. Top level decisions to move naval forces prior to commitment have not been required because they were operating in international waters. Because they operate in international waters, permission from a foreign country has never been necessary to proceed to the scene of a crisis, whereas U.S. land-based planes en route to Lebanon and the Congo required overflight clearances, sometimes a time-consuming requirement.

The aircraft carrier is sovereign U.S. territory. The carriers have proven themselves to be initially self-sustaining and readily replenishable at sea during all of the crises in which they have played a role. In these crises they have not had to depend on prepositioned base facilities, supplies, etc., since overseas replenishment has been made at sea from an underway replenishment group. Carrier's launch and recovery areas have proven as extensive as international waters; for example, a show of force over the Taiwan Straits and a few days later a strike from the Yellow Sea against Pyongyang. Tactically, carriers have been able, as in the Tachens evacuation and the Quemoy-Matsu crises, to concentrate as a single force to obtain desirable odds.

The records show that attack carrier force levels rose from a low of seven at the beginning of Korea to 18 at the end by recommissioning from the inventory created by World War II; force levels subsequently ranged from 19 in 1956, to 14 in 1960, to 15 at the present time. The average number of active carriers has been slightly more than 15.

Secondly, in the Far East, a maximum deployment of five carriers has been recurrent; in the Mediterranean, three have been used with additional carriers pushed forward in the Eastern Atlantic; and in the Caribbean, three have been called out.

This history, covering a decade and a half, suggests the following conclusions about attack carriers:

They have typically been on the scene when needed.

They have been directly involved in the majority of post-World War II crises.

They have been ideally suited for the projection overseas of U.S. military power either discreetly or ostentatiously.

They have been adaptable to a wide range of missions.

Carriers have always been used advantageously by the United States; it is difficult for me to conceive of accomplishing the same results with fewer.

SUMMARY OF USES OF CVA'S SINCE 1950—CRISIS AND MISSION

Inchon: Provided air cover for amphibious landings.

Inchon, Lebanon, Thailand: Provided air cover for deployment of land-based air and troops—in Lebanon from time of landing of troops until relieved of air support responsibility six weeks later.

Korea: Provided close air support for ground forces.

Yugoslavia, Tachens, Jordan, Lebanon, Congo, Quemoy-Matsu, Dominican Republic: Provided U.S. military presence.

Cuba, Guatemala, and Nicaragua: Prepared to conduct blockade, search, and attack.

Hungnam, Tachens: Provided air cover for amphibious evacuation.

Korea: Interdicted logistic net and neutralized airfields.

Berlin: Contributed to nuclear strategic deterrent.

Suez, Cuba: Provided air cover for evacuation of U.S. civilians in crisis area.

Korea: Transported Army and Air Force equipment including planes, jeeps, vans, ammunition, etc.

Congo: Transported gasoline to U.N. forces.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, today we begin the debate on the amendment to defer the construction of a second attack carrier already funded in part; and once again, as is so well pointed out in an editorial published in the Virginian-Pilot of September 8, 1969, the effectiveness of the attack carrier is being challenged.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY CHALLENGED AGAIN: THE CASE FOR THE CARRIER

The Navy has had, heaven knows, experience enough at defending the aircraft carrier—in concept, propulsion, numbers. Its current campaign against the Mondale-Case amendment in the Senate to cut the projected third nuclear-powered carrier from the 1970 military authorization bill is a reminder that one decade ago Senator William Proxmire was arguing against the construction of a second nuclear carrier on the grounds that the first, which was a year from launching, would be obsolete in this "age of intercontinental and intermediate-range ballistic missiles."

In those days the Navy was insisting that the big attack carrier had a nuclear-deterrent role, just like the Polaris-missile submarines and the land-based ICBM. "In a nuclear war," Admiral George Anderson said when Chief of Naval Operations in the Kennedy years, "any carrier that could launch its air group equipped with nuclear weapons would have performed its mission. Even if ten of our fifteen carriers were caught before they could launch, planes from the five other attack carriers could destroy any country in the world."

That argument soon was shifted; the Navy began to justify the attack carrier for its guarantee to the Nation of "strategic air mobility" in distant corners of the world. Should United States air bases abroad become untenable—as surely they would in many circumstances—the carrier's usefulness as a mobile airfield would become highly important. And even if land bases remained intact and available, carrier readiness and speed would be advantageous. "The best example of comparative reaction time between carrier-based and other air power was the Lebanon crisis," said Vice Admiral P. D. Stroop, then Chief of the Bureau of Weapons, in 1963. "Strike aircraft from the Sixth Fleet were flying 120 sorties a day on the first day—within twelve hours of President Chamoun's request for aid—covering the landing of 5,500 Marines. The carrier planes continued this sortie rate for three weeks until the first land-based aircraft—a TAC strike group flown in to the big NATO jet base at Anda, Turkey—were available for sustained operations."

The Lebanese affair of 1958 remains an argument for the aircraft carrier. It also is an anti-carrier argument. For U.S. people have become progressively skeptical, largely in reaction to the Vietnam War stalemate, of the Government's involving itself in the far-place flareups that from time to time become inevitable. There is opinion that the carrier fleet tempts Washington into sticking its nose where it should not—into continuing its dubious role of world policeman.

Yet there is an overwhelming case for a powerful carrier force. Control of the seas is vital to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to the system of Western alliances upon which the security of the United States has been built. So the Soviet Union's current drive for maritime dominance threatens to become the most important development of this half of the Twentieth Century. The principal Western check on that drive is the carrier and her family of escorts and auxiliaries—is, in brief, the U.S. surface fleet. It is indispensable to the Free World.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON FRIDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on Friday morning at 10 o'clock, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond 10:30 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR UNFINISHED BUSINESS TO BE LAID BEFORE SENATE ON FRIDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid before the Senate as the unfinished business at the conclusion of the transaction of routine morning business on Friday morning, but not later than 10:30 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum will be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1969, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order of September 9, 1969, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock Friday morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, September 12, 1969, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 10, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Joseph S. Farland, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Nancy Hanks, of New York, to be Chairman of the National Council on the Arts for a term of 4 years, vice Roger L. Stevens, term expired.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Edward R. Neaher, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice Joseph P. Hoey, resigned.

U.S. MARSHAL

Gaylord L. Campbell, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the central district of California for the term of 4 years, vice George E. O'Brien, retired.

Arthur F. Van Court, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of California for the term of 4 years, vice John C. Begovich.

Anthony T. Greski, of New Jersey, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Jersey for the term of 4 years, vice Leo A. Mault.

IN THE ARMY

I nominate the following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. George Gray O'Connor, O21088, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Robert Clinton Taber, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Carmin Noble, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Francis Hollingsworth, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Burnside Elijah Huffman, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Warren Kennedy Bennett, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Reiley Guthrie, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edwin I. Donley, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Matthew Rienzi, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Felix John Gerace, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Harwell Barfield, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Michael Flanagan, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bernard William Rogers, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Allen Mitchell Burdett, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Albert Broadus Dillard, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Logan Irby, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard McGowan Lee, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Daniel McLaughlin, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Mayo, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Albert Hamman Smith, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. John Stephan Lekson, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Franklin Milton Davis, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brigadier General Leo Edward Benade, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore Antonelli, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Bennison Fulton, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James George Kalergis, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Erwin Montgomery Graham,

Junior, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harry Lee Jones, Junior, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Paul Young, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Joseph Hennessey, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Darrie Hewitt Richards, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Howard Harrison Cooksey, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Verne Lyle Bowers, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Warren Cobb, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Fred Kornet, Junior, [redacted] Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harold Gregory Moore, Junior, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George William Casey, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alexander Russell Bolling, Junior, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Love Starnes, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Howard Elder, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Edward Pieklik, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. Leo Edward Benade, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Logan Irby, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Carmin Noble, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Mayo, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Felix John Gerace, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Franklin Milton Daxis, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Samuel Beatty, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Clinton Taber, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Paul Alfred Feyereisen, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Albert Hamman Smith, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard George Ciccolella, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Francis Hollingsworth, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Wesley Charles Franklin, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edwin I. Donley, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Warren Cobb, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edwin Montgomery Graham, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Harwell Barfield, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Daniel McLaughlin, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard McGowan Lee, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Jack Jennings Wagstaff, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Warren Kennedy Bennett, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harris Whitton Hollis, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Stephan Lekson, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Albert Broadus Dillard, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Paul Young, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Francis Paul Koisch, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Matthew Rienzi, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Maj. Gen. Willis Dale Crittenberger, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Lawson Johnson, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel United States Army).

Maj. Gen. Donald Hugh McGovern, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Edward Pieklik, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. William Love Starnes, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. Elvy Benton Roberts, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. William Bennison Fulton, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. Harry Lee Jones, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. James George Kalergis, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Maj. Gen. Leonard Burbank Taylor, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general

Col. Thomas McKee Tarpley, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. John Willson Donaldson, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Ira Augustus Hunt, Jr. [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frederick James Kroesen, Jr., [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Ernest Graves, Jr., [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Herbert Joseph McChrystal, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Alexander Meigs Haig, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Shipley Prugh, Jr., [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Frank Ambler Camm, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. William Roy Wolfe, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Morin Shoemaker, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Adrian St. John II [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Robert Myer, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Gordon James Duquemin, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Everett Emerson, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Herbert Ardis Schulke, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles James Simmons, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Harold Ira Hayward, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Thomas Joseph McGuire, Jr., [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. John Quint Henion, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Austin Jackson, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Echols Spragins, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Neale Mackinnon, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Magoun Wallace II, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Richard Del Mar, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Randolph Bigler, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. DeWitt Clinton Smith, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Bartley Kitchens, Jr., [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Jonathan Rowell Burton, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Thomas Wilson Brown, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Archelaus Lewis Hamblen, Jr., [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Harold Robert Aaron, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. James Bradshaw Adamson, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Leahy Fair, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Wilbur Henry Vinson, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Smith Patton [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Royster Thurman III, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Trevor Sawyer, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. John Einar Murray, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Edwin Thomas O'Donnell, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Kenneth Banks Cooper, [redacted] U.S. Army.

Col. Lawrence McCeney Jones, Jr., xxx-xx-x... xxx-x... Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Rolland Valentine Heiser, xxx-xx-xxxx, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Harry Ellsworth Tabor, xxx-xx-xxxx, U.S. Army.

Col. William Holman Brandenburg, xxx-xx-x... xxx-..., U.S. Army.

Col. Harold Burton Gibson, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx xxx-... Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Alfred Kjellstrom, xxx-xx-xxxx, U.S. Army.

Col. Peter George Olenchuk, xxx-xx-xxxx, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Maurice Hall, xxx-xx-xxxx, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Daniel Orrin Graham xxx-xx-xxxx, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Thornton Peterson, xxx-xx-xxxx, U.S. Army.

Col. Frank Anton Hinrichs, xxx-xx-xxxx, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joseph Charles Fimiani, xxx-xx-xxxx, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Walter Collins III, xxx-xx-xxxx, U.S. Army.

Col. Theme Troy Everton, xxx-xx-xxxx, U.S. Army.

Col. John Carpenter Raaen, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx xxx-... U.S. Army.

Col. Alvin Curtely Isaacs, xxx-xx-xxxx, U.S. Army.

Col. Carl Vernon Cash, xxx-xx-xxxx, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Carl Ray Duncan, xxx-xx-xxxx, U.S. Army.

Col. Bruce Campbell Babbitt, xxx-xx-xxxx, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Charles Hixon, xxx-xx-xxxx, U.S. Army.

Col. John Murphy Dunn xxx-xx-xxxx, Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

Col. James Alexander Grimsley, Jr., xxx-... xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army)

Col. Eugene Priest Forrester, xxx-xx-xxxx, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 10, 1969:

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Wayman G. Sherrer, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Alabama for the term of 4 years.

Peter Mills, of Maine, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Maine for the term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHALS

Harold S. Fountain, of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Alabama for the term of 4 years.

John H. deWinter, of Maine, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Maine for the term of 4 years.

Marvin G. Washington, of Michigan, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Michigan for the term of 4 years.

Charles S. Guy, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ONE MILLION STUDENTS BENEFIT FROM COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM—ROXANNE LAHTI RECOGNIZED AT OFFICE OF EDUCATION CEREMONY

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 10, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in the 5 years since it was passed by the Congress, the college work-study program has opened the door to a college education to many young people who might not otherwise have had the opportunity.

This morning it was my pleasure to participate in a ceremony at the U.S. Office of Education recognizing Miss Roxanne Lahti, of the University of Minnesota, as the one-millionth student to participate in this valuable program.

Miss Lahti was presented a certificate signed by Dr. James E. Allen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education, which read as follows:

Given in recognition of Roxanne Lahti as the one-millionth student in college work-study program of federal financial assistance to the youth of America in her education.

Dr. Preston Valien, Acting Associate Commissioner for Higher Education, presided and an informative address was made by Timothy Wirth, assistant to the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Two distinguished legislative leaders from the House of Representatives, Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, who represents Miss Lahti's district in Minnesota, and Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS, member of the House Education Subcommittee, had timely remarks about this young lady and the program that is helping her obtain a college education. I was privileged to speak for the Senate Education Subcommittee.

Also participating in the program were James W. Moore, Director of the Office of Education's Division of Student Financial Aid, and these Office of Education staff members: Norman Brooks, James Allen, Mike Oliver, Warren Troutman, and Ed Sanders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. Wirth and my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the addresses were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY TIMOTHY WIRTH

It is a pleasure to greet the distinguished guests who have come here this morning to join us in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in honoring Miss Roxanne Lahti, the one millionth student to hold a job under the College Work-Study program.

Roxanne grew up on a farm near Barnum, Minnesota, where she attended high school, taking an active part in her school's activities—including playing clarinet in the band. She has done all the work there is to do in running a farm—beginning with milking cows at age four—and learning, by age nineteen, to say "You can't beat the tranquillity of the country."

As a former peach farmer from California, I know Miss Lahti has long been interested in medical science. This, with her natural love for animals, has led her to an early and logical career choice. She is going to be a veterinarian.

Her school—the University of Minnesota, Duluth Campus—also made a logical choice in arranging Miss Lahti's summer time job under the College Work-Study program. She was employed by the Duluth Zoo, where she bottle fed baby tigers and other young animals, and worked in the museum.

Wherever possible, the 2,200 colleges participating in the College Work-Study program try to provide employment for their students in occupations related to their career objectives. For example:

James Bryant, a 30-year old veteran majoring in special education here in Washington at D.C. Teachers College, spent the summer working with elementary school children with learning difficulties;

Horace Williams, a major in graphic designs at the Kansas City Art Institute and School of Design, has been writing pamphlets and taking pictures for the Police Department this summer;

Findley Scribner, a deaf mute vocational student at Idaho State University, who plans to become an upholsterer, has been refurbishing a college office this summer.

Lydia Sonia Vasquez, a business administration major at Metropolitan State College in Denver, works as a secretary in the College's Financial Aid Office;

Eilien Duda, a senior at Alaska Methodist University in Anchorage, who wants to be a nuclear technician, is working as a hospital x-ray technician;

William S. LaCorte, a pre-med student at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, has worked this summer in biomedical research with NIH's National Cancer Institute;

Employment in the College Work-Study program is varied: Some students are also food service workers, typists, library assistants. Some mow the lawns and others work with sophisticated computers, or work off-campus in hospitals, local units of government or in the school system. But they have one thing in common: They are performing a useful service, and they all need their job to help pay college expenses.

As a Nation we move toward the goal that no talented young American will be denied a college education because he can't afford the costs. We are not there yet—but every year we get a little closer to the goal, and our society is that much richer for it.

This year more than a million young Americans will continue their education beyond high school with the help of about one billion dollars in Federal support through the four major programs of financial assistance administered by the Office of Education: The College Work-Study program, the National Defense Student Loan program, the Educational Opportunity Grant program, and the Guaranteed Loan program.

Many of you in Congress who are here today have worked hard, using your time and creative talents in developing and supporting the legislation that makes these statistics possible. And I am certain that you share with us a pride in the knowledge of